Fiftieth
Federal-Provincial
Wildlife Conference

TRANSACTIONS
1986

Ottawa, Ontario
June 17 - 20

87-02617/

DATES, SITES, AND THEMES FOR FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL WILDLIFE CONFERENCES

1922-1954	Ottawa, Ontario
1955	Montreal, Quebec
1956	Vancouver, British Columbia
1957	Ottawa, Ontario
1958	St. John's, Newfoundland
1959	Ottawa, Ontario
1960	Regina, Saskatchewan
1961	Ottawa, Ontario
1962	Fredericton, New Brunswick
1963	Ottawa, Ontario
1964	Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
1965	Winnipeg, Manitoba
1966	Quebec, Quebec
1967	Ottawa, Ontario
1968	Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
1969	Edmonton, Alberta
1970	Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
1971	Toronto, Ontario
1972	Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
1973	Ottawa, Ontario
1974	Victoria, British Columbia (People and wildlife)
1975	St. John's, Newfoundland (Wildlife values)
1976	Fredericton, New Brunswick (Federal-provincial initiatives in wildlife management)
1977	Winnipeg, Manitoba (Wildlife enforcement in Canada)
1978	Quebec, Quebec (Use of wildlife)
1979	Regina, Saskatchewan (Habitat is the key)
1980	Ottawa, Ontario (A national policy on wildlife)
1981	Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island (A national policy on wildlife - Phase II)
1982	Whitehorse, Yukon Territory (Wildlife in Canada's North)
1983	Edmonton, Alberta (Wildlife management - Today and tomorrow)
1984	Timmins, Ontario (Team-work in wildlife management)
1985	Halifax, Nova Scotia (Communicating about wildlife)
1986	Ottawa, Ontario (Canada's role in world wildlife conservation)
1987	Tuktoyaktuk, Northwest Territories
1988	Victoria, British Columbia
1989	St. John's, Newfoundland
1990	Winnipeg, Manitoba
1991	Fredericton, New Brunswick

Environment Canada

Environnement Canada

Canadian Wildlife Service

Service canadien de la faune

Transactions of the
Fiftieth Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference
held in Ottawa, Ontario
17-20 June
1986

Issued under the authority of the
Minister of Environment

Canadian Wildlife Service

Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1986
Catalogue No. CW69-3/50E
ISBN 0-662-15132-1
ISSN 0069-0007

Printing: Runge Press Ltd.
Contract No. KN107-6-2414

CONTENTS

5 Summary of the 50th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference

11 Official welcome -- G.M. Gurbin

Update reports

14 Action taken on recommendations of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference -- D.K. Pollock
20 Canadian Wildlife Service -- H.A. Clarke
23 US Fish and Wildlife Service -- F. Dunkle
32 Forestry/Wildlife Workshop -- M. Mogford
34 Wildlife Colloquium -- D. Munro
37 National Wildlife Week -- K.A. Brynaert
40 Summary of discussion on National Wildlife Week
42 Ramsar (1): Global developments -- D. Navid
46 Ramsar (2): Canada -- D.S. Morrison
48 Ramsar (3): Summary of comments -- M. Smart
50 Ramsar (4): Summary of discussion
53 "World conservation strategy" -- H.K. Eidsvik

Keynote speech

57 Canada's role in world wildlife conservation -- S. Bata
63 Summary of discussion

Panel on CITES

66 (1) Introduction of panel members -- B. des Clers
67 (2) The CITES perspective -- E. Lapointe
68 (3) International legal perspectives -- R.M. Parsons
72 (4) A non-governmental organization perspective -- K.A. Brynaert
75 (5) A native perspective -- R. Pedersen
78 (6) A non-consumptive user's perspective -- B.K. MacKay
85 (7) Summary of discussion on CITES
93 (8) Chairman's comments and concluding remarks -- B. des Clers

Panel on "North American waterfowl management plan"

96 (1) Introduction of panel members -- R. Andrews
97 (2) A federal perspective -- J. Patterson
99 (3) A non-governmental organization perspective -- A.J. Macaulay
102 (4) An agricultural perspective -- H.O. Sparrow
105 (5) A United States perspective -- H.K. Nelson
109 (6) A native perspective -- D. Porter
111 (7) Summary of comments -- C. Maxwell
113 (8) Summary of discussion

Canada's international image

116 (1) Introduction -- D. Neave
117 (2) Canada's international image in wildlife conservation -- D. Munro
120 (3) Summary of comments -- J. Berryman

(continued)

121 Fur Institute's communication strategy -- K. Smith
125 Summary of discussion

Workshops

1. Export of technology and funds

127 Chairman's comments -- R.W. Roberts
132 Summary of report -- R.J. Herring

2. Different perceptions of Canada's programs

134 Summary of report -- J. Inder

3. More effective international agreements

136 Summary of report -- J. Lord

4. Identification of new international opportunities

138 Chairman's comments -- H.K. Eidsvik
140 Summary of report -- J. Walker

142 Summary of discussion

Conference summary

144 Impressions of the proceedings -- P.O'Malley

Reports

149 Annual highlight reports
151 Status of waterfowl -- CWS
156 Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) -- J.A. Keith
157 Summary of discussion
159 Polar Bear Administrative Committee (PBAC) -- I. Stirling and K. Lloyd

161 Recommendations of the 50th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference

168 Comments on conference -- L. Mason

169 Attendance at 50th conference

SUMMARY OF THE 50TH FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

1. Conference opening

H.A. (Tony) Clarke, Director General, Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS), Environment Canada, was Conference Chairman. He opened the conference by welcoming old friends, as well as new ones, to Ottawa and the 50th conference. He then introduced Dr. Gary Gurbin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment.

Dr. Gurbin welcomed delegates on behalf of the Hon. Tom McMillan, who was unable to attend the conference because of other commitments. In his welcoming address, Dr. Gurbin said that it was particularly fitting that on their golden anniversary they were turning their attention to the international scene. He mentioned that the past month or so had truly been a period in Canada for reflection on conservation on the global scale, with various conferences being held in Ottawa. He also said that one pleasant duty he had was to announce officially that 1987 would be a special year in Canada for wildlife, as it would be recognized as National Wildlife Year. Dr. Gurbin's presentation is included in these transactions.

2. Appointment of Recommendations Committee

The 1986 Recommendations Committee consisted of: J. Anthony Keith, Canadian Wildlife Service (Chairman); Stephen Hazell, Canadian Wildlife Federation (Secretary); Dennis Sherratt, Saskatchewan; Doug Hagan, Ontario; and Jean Cinq-Mars, Canadian Wildlife Service.

3. Announcement of representatives to National Waterfowl Advisory Committee

Steven Curtis, Acting Director, Migratory Birds Branch, Canadian Wildlife Service, announced that this year's provincial representatives to the National Waterfowl Advisory Committee meeting were Bob Andrews (Alberta) and Don Simkin (Ontario). This is the annual meeting in the United States at which the waterfowl seasons and regulations are established.

4. Report of action taken on 1985 conference recommendations

Doug Pollock reported on the action taken on last year's recommendations. His report can be found in these transactions.

5. Update on the Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS)

Some of the highlights mentioned by H.A. Clark, Director General, were as follows. Without a doubt, he said, the highlight of the past year was the signing of the "North American waterfowl management plan". He mentioned the Whooping Crane recovery plan which had been drafted and was being implemented. He also stated that CWS had been and still was a major participant in the planning, organization and funding of the International Ornithological Congress. Other topics touched on included the recent Wildlife Colloquium and the Latin-American Program. Other highlights can be found in Mr. Clarke's report in these transactions.

6. Update on the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

Harvey Nelson, Regional Director, US Fish and Wildlife Service, gave the update on the Service. He said that, since the last Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, the USFWS and CWS had been involved in a number of significant efforts aimed at the conservation of numerous wildlife species and their habitats. He stated that it was quite apparent that Canada had taken a leading role in international conservation in the past year, and would also in 1987, on the basis of the important international meetings that had been hosted and those that would be hosted next year. He went on to talk about several joint Canada/US projects, and also spoke to the delegates about various US programs. His complete report can be found in these transactions.

7. Update on Forestry-Wildlife Workshop

Mary Mogford, Deputy Minister, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, brought the conference up-to-date on planning for the Forestry-Wildlife Workshop. She explained that the workshop had to be postponed again because Ontario's proposed timber management planning process would be undergoing an Environmental Assessment Act hearing beginning in late 1986 or early 1987. It was now expected that the workshop would take place in late 1987 or early 1988. Ms. Mogford's update is included in these transactions.

8. Report on Wildlife Colloquium

David Munro, President, Naivasha Consultants, reported on the Wildlife Colloquium held in Ottawa in May, at which he was a moderator. He listed the aims of the colloquium as follows: to propose and examine new methods of management, new financial sources and new arrangements that might help to make conservation activities more effective. Dr. Munro's report can be found in these transactions.

9. Discussion on National Wildlife Week

Ken Brynaert, Executive Vice-President, Canadian Wildlife Federation, led the discussion on National Wildlife Week. He expressed disappointment and concern over the lack of participation in the Week. He said that they were missing a golden opportunity in not using it to communicate about wildlife. Mr. Brynaert's report is included in these transactions.

10. Theme for 1987 conference

The choice of theme for 1987 will be left to the Program Committee for the 1987 conference. Delegates will be canvassed for suggestions for theme, speakers and set-up of the agenda.

11. Program Committee for 1987 conference

Next year's conference will be hosted by the Department of Renewable Resources for the Government of the Northwest Territories. The Chairman will be Kevin Lloyd (NWT), and the Secretary is Douglas Pollock (CWS). Other members of the committee will be: Ken Brynaert (Canadian Wildlife Federation), Stewart Morrison (Ducks Unlimited

Canada), David Neave (Wildlife Habitat Canada), Nellie Cournoyea (NWT), Paul Gray NWT), Jim Walker (British Columbia), Dave Pike (Newfoundland), Don Simkin (Ontario) and Gordon Kerr (CWS); other local NWT non-governmental organizations will be involved in developing the overall program to add a northern flavour to it.

12. 1987 conference

Kevin Lloyd, Director, Wildlife Management Division, NWT, invited all attendees at the 50th conference to attend the 51st conference in Tuktoyaktuk, NWT. He hoped that everyone would enjoy seeing the Arctic in the spring. He said that there would be ample accommodation should families of delegates wish to attend. He mentioned that there would be interesting field trips associated with the conference, and that planning for the conference was well under way. He said that if some unanticipated logistical difficulties were encountered with the conference in Tuk, it would be hosted in Yellowknife.

13. Ramsar

Daniel Navid, Head, International Relations, IUCN, Switzerland, and D. Stewart Morrison, Executive Vice-President, Ducks Unlimited Canada, brought the conference up-to-date on recent Ramsar activities and plans for the 1987 Ramsar Conference to be held in Regina. Michael Smart, Assistant Director (Conservation), IWRB, England also commented on Ramsar. The three presentations are included in these transactions.

14. "World conservation strategy"

Harold Eidsvik, Senior Policy Adviser, Parks Canada, and Chairman, IUCN Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas, reported on the "World conservation strategy" Conference held in Ottawa in early June 1986. His report is included in these transactions.

15. Keynote speech

Geneviève Sainte-Marie, Deputy Minister, Environment Canada, introduced the Keynote Speaker, Mrs. Sonja Bata.

Mrs. Bata spoke of situations in various developing countries. She stressed that education was the key at all levels and said they must try to help other countries with accelerated educational programs. She said Canada could and should play an important role in education. She suggested that they set an example of how this could be done, and that they should help other people, other countries, do the same thing in their own way. She said the world was expecting this from them. Her speech is included in these transactions.

16. CITES panel

James Bourque, Deputy Minister, Renewable Resources, NWT, was Session Chairperson. He introduced the panel topic and its Chairperson.

Bertrand des Clers, Director, International Foundation for the Conservation of Game, France, was Chairperson for this panel. Panel members included: Eugene Lapointe, Secretary-General, CITES Secretariat, Switzerland; Richard M. Parsons, Attorney, Washington Counsel, Safari Club International, USA; Kenneth Brynaert, Executive Vice-President, Canadian Wildlife Federation; the Hon. Red Pedersen, Minister, Renewable Resources, NWT; and Barry Kent MacKay, representative, International Wildlife Coalition. The panelists' reports and a summary of the discussion period which followed are included in these transactions.

17. "North American waterfowl management plan" panel

The Session Chairperson, James Bourque, welcomed delegates to the panel discussion and introduced the Chairperson.

Bob Andrews, Director of Wildlife, Alberta, was Chairperson for the panel. The panel consisted of the following: Dr. James H. Patterson, Director, "North American waterfowl management plan", Canadian Wildlife Service; Dr. A.J. (Sandy) Macaulay, Chief Biologist, Ducks Unlimited Canada; the Hon. Herbert O. Sparrow, Deputy Chairman, Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry; Harvey K. Nelson, Regional Director, US Fish and Wildlife Service; and the Hon. David Porter, Minister, Renewable Resources, Yukon Territory. A summary of the discussion as well as the panelists' presentations are included in these transactions.

18. Canada's international image

David Neave, Executive Director, Wildlife Habitat Canada, Session Chairman, introduced Dr. David Munro, President, Naivasha Consultants.

Dr. Munro commented that Canada had many images, depending on the point of view of the beholders and what their interests were. He said image did not always reflect reality. He reiterated Mrs. Bata's statement that it would not be possible to achieve conservation throughout the world unless something was done in order to relieve poverty, to diminish the imbalance in welfare and security between the rich and the poor parts of the world. Dr. Munro felt that that message was the single, most important message that could be brought to any group of people in Canada, or anywhere in the world, at this time. Dr. Munro's report is included in these transactions.

19. Fur Institute communication strategy

Kirk Smith, Chairman, Public Information, Fur Institute of Canada, was introduced by David Neave.

Mr. Smith spoke about environmental issues, the conservation message, responding to public concerns, conservation repositioning and related matters. He dealt briefly with trap research, trappers' education and communication. He said that together they could ensure a healthy future for the fur industry for generations to come. He also felt that together they could ensure that the conservation ethic continued to be a basic tenet of their society. His complete report is included in these transactions.

20. Workshops

The question for the workshops was: "How do we optimize our efforts in world wildlife conservation?" David Neave introduced the workshop chairpersons. The workshops, their topics, chairpersons and rapporteurs are listed below:

Workshop 1

"Through our export of technology and funds?"

Chairperson	Rapporteur
Ralph Roberts Forestry Sector - Chief CIDA Ottawa, Ont.	Richard J. Herring Assistant Deputy Minister Canadian Forestry Service Agriculture Canada Hull, Que.

Workshop 2

"Through the different perceptions of Canada's wildlife resources and management programs?"

Chairperson	Rapporteur
Richard Goulden Director Manitoba Wildlife Branch Winnipeg, Man.	Jim Walker Assistant Deputy Minister Parks, Recreation and Wildlife Newfoundland Department of Culture, Recreation, and Youth St. John's, Nfld.

Workshop 3

"Through more effective current international agreements?"

Chairperson	Rapporteur
Julyan Reid Director General Intergovernmental Affairs Directorate Corporate Planning Group Environment Canada Hull, Que.	Judy Lord Editor Nature Canada Canadian Nature Federation Ottawa, Ont.

Workshop 4

"Through identification of new international opportunities?"

Chairperson	Rapporteur
Harold Eidsvik Senior Policy Adviser Parks Canada Hull, Que.	Jim Walker Director BC Wildlife Branch Victoria, BC

Rapporteurs reports are included in these transactions. Messrs. Roberts (Workshop 1) and Eidsvik (Workshop 2) also presented their comments, which can be found in these transactions.

21. Summary of conference

Peter O'Malley, President, O'Malley Communications, Ottawa, summarized speeches, panel presentations and the results of workshops. His summarization is included in these transactions.

22. Highlight reports

Reports were received from nine provinces and one territory. Nova Scotia and the Yukon Territory did not submit reports. Reports were also received from eight NGOs. Copies of these reports can be obtained from the various departments/organizations. Addresses are listed in these transactions under "Annual highlight reports".

23. Recommendations Committee report

This year's Chairman, J.A. (Tony) Keith, led the discussion period and voting on the recommendations; 24 recommendations were approved by the voting delegates (one vote for each province/territory and one vote for the Canadian Wildlife Service).

24. Attendance

There were 152 registered participants in this year's conference.

25. Dates of subsequent conferences

The following dates have been confirmed for future conferences:

1987, 16-19 June (51st) - Tuktoyaktuk, Northwest Territories
1988, 14-17 June (52nd) - Victoria, British Columbia
1989, 20-23 June (53rd) - St. John's, Newfoundland
1990, 19-22 June (54th) - Winnipeg, Manitoba
1991, 18-21 June (55th) - Fredericton, New Brunswick

OFFICIAL WELCOME

G.M. Gurbin, MP
Parliamentary Secretary
to the Minister of the Environment

On behalf of the Hon. Tom McMillan, Minister of the Environment, I would like to welcome delegates from the 10 provinces, two territories and the federal government to this--the longest-running federal-provincial conference in Canada--the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the attendance of Wildlife Ministers: the Hon. Red Pedersen, Minister of Renewable Resources, Government of the Northwest Territories, and the Hon. Dave Porter, Minister of Renewable Resources, Yukon Territorial Government. We are pleased that you have come. I would also like to express an especially warm welcome to visitors representing the Government of the United States, and to representatives of non-governmental conservation organizations of Europe, the United States and Canada.

This is the 50th time this conference has been held--an achievement of which we in Canada can be justly proud. I think it is particularly fitting that on our golden anniversary we turn our attention to the international scene of which we are all part. This year's theme--"Canada's role in world wildlife conservation"--is very appropriate because, while we are primarily concerned with national programs, we must always retain the sense of our place in the world, and realize that many of our national programs have international ramifications.

Through the agenda you will be discussing many topics that will provide an opportunity to improve understanding of international conservation, and perhaps even to enhance our international image. An example is the Ramsar Convention (Convention on the Conservation of Wetlands of International Importance). The agreement that produced the Convention was signed in 1971. Since then, it has become increasingly apparent that North Americans must be interested in and concerned with what is happening in the Caribbean and Central and South America, and those parts of Western Europe and Eastern Asia that share North America's birds.

It is simply not enough to conserve wetlands in Canada, if the wetlands in other countries that sustain Canadian birds for more than half the year are so destroyed or damaged by competing uses of land that they cannot provide for migrants from North America. It was with a spirt of "selfish altruism" that Canada became a signatory of the Ramsar Convention and dedicated the Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area to the list of wetlands designated internationally as being of importance. Canada, with the co-operation of the provincial and territorial governments, has now expanded its list of designated wetlands from one to 17.

Events in Canada

The past month or so has truly been a period, here in Canada, for reflection on conservation on the global scale. During the last week in May, an important event for the world-wide environment movement took place here in Ottawa, namely the visit to Canada of the World Commission on Environment and Development, the Brundtland Commission. This international body is looking at how the nations of the world manage their environmental resources, including wildlife.

Clearly the world's wildlife and the habitat on which they depend are being threatened by the dire poverty of many of the world's nations--and to say that is not to lose respect for the threat that has grown in those more developed and economically advantaged regions, but particularly in areas of poverty. The harsh realities of human survival are such that wildlife and natural ecosystems are necesssarily of secondary importance. Yet wildlife and agriculture are both products of a healthy landscape and, in the long run, the solutions required to sustain human populations are remarkably similar to those needed for wildlife. In fact, it would be fair to comment on the decline in healthy habitat for both human and wildlife populations.

You will also note that the "World conservation strategy" is on your agenda for the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference. This is particularly appropriate because, in addition to the Brundtland Commission's visit, Ottawa was the site, for the first week in June, of the "World conservation strategy" Conference. Some of you attended that conference, and are aware that the "World conservation strategy" calls on all nations to adopt conservation policies and practices at home to join international efforts to improve the human environment throughout the world, and to protect the biosphere that sustains all life on earth. That is a tall order, but we in Canada believe we are trying to be good practitioners of the tenets of the "World conservation strategy".

In Canada, responsibility for the management and conservation of natural resources is shared by the federal government, 10 provinces and two territories (and often among departments within those governments). Much has been, and can only continue to be, accomplished through close co-operation and shared knowledge. This annual wildlife conference provides an excellent forum for federal-provincial co-operation. But we feel the compulsion to redouble our efforts and our resolve, both in Canada and in the international arena, in order to ensure effective stewardship over our resources, including wildlife.

Waterfowl management

You will be including in your conference a panel discussion on the "North American waterfowl management plan". This plan clearly demonstrates the ability of Canada and the United States to work co-operatively on issues of international resource management. The development of the "North American waterfowl management plan" is perhaps the most important event in the history of waterfowl management since the Migratory Birds Convention of 1916.

The plan is largely a response to the major decline of populations of key species of ducks on the Prairies and elsewhere in North America. Waterfowl experts in both Canada and the United States have recognized that, although a number of factors have been important, the primary cause of the population decline is the loss of waterfowl habitat.

New partnerships will be established with the agricultural sector and with private landowners in order to restore the capacity of the landscape to sustain both waterfowl and a viable agricultural economy. Soil and water conservation are the key to both.

Mr. McMillan had the pleasure of signing the plan with Donald Hodel, the United States Secretary of the Interior, on 14 May. It is now necessary for both countries to take action to implement the plan. Work on the plan and the successes realized to date represent one of the major highlights of overall work done by Environment Canada over the last 8-9 months.

This plan is by no means just a federal initiative, and has enjoyed the co-operative participation through all stages of the provinces, territories and client groups. I understand that the first meeting of the Canadian Waterfowl Advisory Council has taken place here in Ottawa. So the momentum is continuing on this far-reaching initiative.

Year of celebration

In 1987, we will have an important year for wildlife conservation in Canada--the Minister and his provincial colleagues are pleased to announce that 1987 will be declared as "a special year for recognizing the importance of wildlife conservation in Canada".

We, the Government of Canada, are very pleased that non-governmental wildlife groups have suggested this year-long celebration of wildlife conservation. They have been enthusiastic in their leadership and have the full support of Mr. McMillan and his provincial colleagues. Celebration in 1987 will deal with planned events and accomplishments by various governments and non-governmental and private-sector groups.

As part of "Wildlife '87", we will have the honour of hosting two international meetings:

(1) the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (the Ramsar Convention) will hold their 3rd convention in Regina from 27 May to 5 June, and

(2) the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) will meet in Ottawa from 12 to 24 July.

We will also reach an important milestone in our history domestically--1987 will mark the centennial of the establishment of Last Mountain Lake (Saskatchewan) Migratory Bird Sanctuary, the oldest sanctuary in the Western Hemisphere.

So 1987 will be one of the most important years for wildlife conservation since Confederation, and many events will be planned across the country to commemorate wildlife. I hope you will all take part.

Congratulations to your Program Committee and our best wishes to you all as participants in our 50th federal-provincial anniversary. I know you have a full agenda ahead of you. I hope your deliberations will be very productive and that you enjoy the associated events the Program Committee has planned for you.

Update Report

ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 49TH FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

D.K. Pollock
Secretary, Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference

Recommendation No. 1 (Appreciation for hospitality)

That the conference express its appreciation to the Government of Nova Scotia, and in particular to the Hon. Kenneth Streatch, Donald Eldridge, Merrill Prime and other staff of the Department of Lands and Forests, for the excellent arrangements and fine hospitality extended to the delegates of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Action

Letters of appreciation sent to the Hon. Kenneth Streatch, Donald Eldridge and Merrill Prime. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 2 (Thanks for reception)

That the conference express its appreciation to Environment Canada and the Canadian Wildlife Service for the reception on the eve of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Action

Thank-you memorandum sent to Director General, Canadian Wildlife Service. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 3 (Thanks for breakfast)

That the conference express its appreciation to Ducks Unlimited Canada for hosting a breakfast on 27 June for delegates to the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Action

Thank-you letter sent to Stewart Morrison, Ducks Unlimited Canada. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 4 (Appreciation to non-governmental organizations)

That the conference express its appreciation to participants from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for their contributions to the success of the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Action

Letters of appreciation sent to all NGO attendees who participated in the conference. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 5 (Disappointment on absence of British Columbia)

That the conference express its disappointment to the Government of British Columbia on the absence of representation from the Ministry of Environment from that province.

Action

Letter sent to the Minister, British Columbia Ministry of Environment, expressing concern on the absence of British Columbia at the conference and hope that British Columbia would be represented in 1986. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 6 (Appreciation to J.D. Roseborough, A. Murray and H. Haswell)

Whereas Doug Roseborough, Al Murray and Hugh Haswell have contributed actively to wildlife management and to the work of the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference during their distinguished careers,

therefore the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference directs the Secretary to express to Messrs. Haswell, Murray and Roseborough its appreciation for their service and best wishes on their retirement.

Action

Letters of appreciation sent to Messrs. Haswell, Murray and Roseborough for their service to wildlife and best wishes on their retirement. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 7 (Theme for 1986 National Wildlife Week)

Whereas an effective National Wildlife Week requires a link with identifiable wildlife species, and

whereas a carefully developed theme and message can focus attention on the status and importance of wildlife in Canada, especially to school-children,

therefore it is recommended that the 1986 National Wildlife Week theme involve the issue of endangered species of wildlife.

Action

Letter sent to Ken Brynaert recommending that the theme should deal with the issue of endangered species of wildlife. The exact wording of the theme was left to the Canadian Wildlife Federation. The theme for 1986 was "Together, we can help wildlife!". Action completed.

Recommendation No. 8 (Theme for 1987 National Wildlife Week)

Whereas 1987 represents the 100th anniversary of Last Mountain Lake Sanctuary in Saskatchewan, and

whereas this event will focus attention on past and present conservation initiatives with a view to the future, and whereas success of future conservation efforts hinges on enthusiastic support and co-operation involving government and the public,

therefore it is recommended that consideration be given to a theme for 1987 National Wildlife Week embodying historical and future wildlife conservation in Canada.

Action

Letter was sent to Ken Brynaert recommending that consideration be given to a theme for 1987 National Wildlife Week that would embody historical and future wildlife conservation in Canada. Action on-going.

Recommendation No. 9 (Maintenance of wildlife programs)

Whereas the wildlife-related activities of the Government of Canada flow from acts of Parliament, the Migratory Birds Convention Act (1917) and the Canada Wildlife Act (1973), and

whereas these activities enable the discharge of both domestic and international responsibilities, and

whereas there has recently been substantial evidence of public support for such activities,

therefore it is recommended that the Government of Canada, in consultation with the governments of the provinces and territories and interested non-governmental organizations, maintain a vigorous program for the benefit of wildlife and its users throughout Canada.

Action

Conference Chairman sent letter to Minister of Environment Canada requesting consideration of the recommendation. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 10 (Preparation for 1987 CITES Conference)

Whereas Canada will host the next meeting of the Parties to CITES in 1987, and

whereas the time to begin preparations for that meeting is now,

therefore it is recommended that federal, provincial and territorial governments, and national non-governmental organizations establish a close working relationship in order to ensure: that Canadian positions and concerns be negotiated well before the next meeting; that the roles and responsibilities of delegation members be defined; that Canada's CITES administration and scientific programs be well supported over the 2 years between meetings of the Parties; and that responses to Canadian CITES issues arising from the 1985 meeting be finalized as soon as possible.

Action

Letters sent to all jurisdictions in August and December asking for suggestions for the conference and nominations for the steering committee. In May, the federal

Minister sent a telex to all Wildlife Ministers nominating a core group for the Canadian delegation to the CITES 1987 meeting as follows:

J.B. Heppes, CITES Administrator, CWS,
T.C. Dauphiné, CITES Scientific Authority, CWS,
D. Brackett, provincial-territorial representative, Government of the Northwest Territories,
M. Shoesmith, provincial-territorial representative, Government of Manitoba, and
an officer to be nominated from External Affairs.

Jurisdictions were asked to provide by 30 May a list of "issues" that need to be discussed by Canada. Suggestions were also requested for positions of head of the Canadian delegation and Chairman of the 1987 CITES meeting. Some responses have been received. The federal Minister is still awaiting replies from other jurisdictions. When all replies are received, a decision will be made on these two positions, and recommendations will be made to the Minister of State for External Affairs.

All provincial-territorial wildlife jurisdictions have been invited to attend a meeting of the Special Events Committee on 15 July 1986. Other departments and NGOs invited to attend include Fisheries and Oceans Canada, External Affairs, Canadian Wildlife Federation, Canadian Nature Federation, Ottawa Field Naturalists' Club, Ottawa Duck Club, Diomedea Consultants and Adventure Consultants. As well, Mayor Jim Durrell and representatives from the Ottawa Congress Centre and Canada's Capital Visitors and Convention Bureau have been asked to attend. Action on-going.

Recommendation No. 11 (Adoption of procedures - CITES)

Whereas considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed regarding the procedures used at the Buenos Aires meeting of the Parties to CITES, and

whereas these procedures appear to have hampered the effectiveness of our Canadian delegation,

therefore it is recommended that this conference urge the CITES Secretariat to pursue the adoption of procedures which give due credit to technical information when additions or changes to listed species are considered.

Action

Letter sent to Secretary General CITES advising him of this recommendation. He replied that the recommendation should be handled through the Canadian Management Authority. Canadian CITES authorities are working with the Secretariat and the Standing Committee of CITES to amend the rules of procedure. The proposals from the Standing Committee were given to the CITES authorities at the November CITES meeting in Hull, Quebec. Action on-going.

Recommendation No. 12 (Dissolution of CCUM)

Whereas a number of species and/or region-specific committees focusing on ungulate management have been established in Canada, and

whereas these specialist committees now largely fulfil the purpose of the Canadian Committee on Ungulate Management, therefore it is recommended that the Canadian Committee on Ungulate Management be dissolved, and that past and present participants in that committee be thanked for their contributions.

Action

Letters sent to all jurisdictions asking them to thank members of their staffs who were involved with this committee (past and present) for a job well done. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 13 (Future timing of conference)

Whereas it is recognized that the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference is traditionally held in the last week of June each year, and

whereas these dates usually conflict with St-Jean-Baptiste Day, which is a statutory holiday not only for the Parliament of Canada but for citizens residing in the Province of Quebec,

therefore it is recommended that future conferences be scheduled to avoid conflict with St-Jean-Baptiste Day.

Action

Program Committee made note of this recommendation. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 14 ("World conservation strategy")

Whereas the conference notes the significance of the "World conservation strategy" for wildlife management within the context of land-use and development planning, and

whereas it believes that the process of formulating conservation strategies would provide a vehicle for beneficial consultation among resource management agencies and interests, and for establishing more constructive, long-term, cross-sectorial working relationships, and

whereas it is noted also that an international conference on conservation and development, implementing the "World conservation strategy", will be held in Ottawa from 31 May to 5 June 1986, and that it is desirable that Canadian jurisdictions are able to show significant progress in this connection,

therefore it is recommended that wildlife administrations associate themselves with the formulation of conservation strategies in those jurisdictions where they are under way, and that they stimulate and support the initiation of conservation strategies in other jurisdictions.

Action

Letters sent to all jurisdictions asking them to take action to implement this recommendation in their departments. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 15 (Communicating about wildlife)

Whereas an in-depth discussion on communicating about wildlife and wildlife management has taken place at the 49th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, and

whereas assessments of past events and the knowledge of communication experts have revealed that appropriate communication is crucial to the survival of wildlife management, and

whereas the repercussions of controversial wildlife issues often transcend boundaries of jurisdictions,

therefore it is recommended that all governments be encouraged to improve communication efforts and that governments be encouraged to develop, implement and, if appropriate, exchange communication plans as components of wildlife management programs.

Action

Letters sent to all jurisdictions asking them to take action to implement this recommendation in their departments. Action completed.

Recommendation No. 16 (Establishment of Trust Fund - CITES)

Whereas the conference of the Parties to CITES will be held in Canada in 1987, and

whereas it is important that sufficient funding be available to ensure that activities designed to promote and support Canadian positions among international delegates may be carried out,

therefore it is recommended that each agency responsible for wildlife management in Canada, as well as interested non-governmental organizations, consider contributions during the next two fiscal years to a trust fund to be established by the Canadian Wildlife Service to support such activities.

Action

Letters sent to all jurisdictions requesting consideration of the recommendation and requesting a reply by 13 September 1985. Not all jurisdictions responded. A trust fund has been set up, but no donations have been received to date.

Update report

CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE (CWS)

H.A. Clarke
Director General

I think, without a doubt, the highlight of the past year was the signing of the "North American waterfowl management plan". I will not say very much more about the plan since you have heard a lot about this in the past--Dr. Gurbin mentioned it in his address--but I should tell you that up to the very end it was touch and go as to whether Mr. McMillan and Secretary of the Interior Hodel would sign that document in Washington on 14 May. But it happened, and we now have a blueprint, a statement of intent, that hopefully will shape our actions in this regard for the next 15 years and further into the future. I think that has got to be the significant accomplishment for 1985-86.

The Whooping Crane flocks continue to grow. We signed a "Memorandum of understanding" with the USA, in April last year, to ensure international co-ordination and co-operation in our mutual efforts. A "Whooping Crane recovery plan" has been drafted and is being implemented; the birds seem to be a favourite topic with the news media in the spring. I am happy to say that good progress is being made in this program.

Graham Cooch and CWS have been major participants in the planning, organization and funding of the 29th International Ornithological Congress, held in Ottawa in June.

The Latin American Program continues, and there is a proposal to create a system of shorebird reserves along the staging and wintering areas in Canada, the United States and Latin America. A number of projects were funded in 1985 along the coasts of Peru, Ecuador, Colombia and Brazil. We hope to complete the "South American shorebird atlas" in the not too distant future. Studies completed include the vulnerability of migratory birds to wintering habitat loss in Latin America, and the magnitude of pesticide use in Latin America. It is a good program and seems to be progressing extremely well.

Conservation stamp

In 1985, we had the launching of Canada's first "Wildlife habitat conservation stamp", with its design taken from the original work by Robert Bateman. The $4 stamp is required to be affixed to each Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit sold in Canada. The money from the stamp sales is being "laundered" through to Wildlife Habitat Canada, which has embarked on the very good business of habitat restoration and protection across the country. I am told that the sales of the prints of the original 1985 painting and the stamps have been an unqualified success. Those wanting more information on this matter should contact David Neave (Wildlife Habitat Canada).

Incidentally, the artwork for the 1986 stamp, produced by J. Fenwick Lansdowne and entitled "Canvasbacks in spring", was unveiled in Toronto in March of this year.

As you have heard, the next conference of CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species) will be held here in Ottawa next year. Canada is attempting to get itself into a state of preparedness for that meeting. I gather Buenos Aires was quite an event from everyone I have spoken to, and we hope that we can help make the 1987 conference run a bit more smoothly. I want you to know that work has started already in that regard.

For those of you who are interested in numbers, 4183 endangered species export permits were approved or issued by federal, provincial and territorial authorities last year, mainly for CITES Appendix II species.

On humane trapping, Environment Canada provided half-a-million dollars to the Fur Institute of Canada as part of its commitment to a $1.5 million program over 4 years, which started in 1983-84, specifically for research and development of humane trapping systems. We are pleased to say that matters seem to be progressing quite smoothly. The construction of a humane trap research and testing facility at Végreville in Alberta was completed in the fall of 1985 and it is now fully operational.

Socio-economic information is appreciated by decision-makers at all levels. We at CWS were successful in starting a project in 1981, and at least four reports have been published, with I gather a fifth on its way. I am certain that most of you have seen the socio-economic report on the "Value of wildlife to Canadians" which was issued around the time of the Colloquium this past May. In case anyone thinks this smacks of blatant advocacy, I will refer you to Statistics Canada, which confirms that the methodology used in the survey is above reproach. Results did show that expenditures by participants in wildlife-related activities in Canada account for an injection of $8.8 billion annually to the Canadian economy, support 185 000 jobs, and provide government tax revenues worth nearly $2 billion.

New fund for research

The Wildlife Toxicology Fund, which is being administered by the World Wildlife Fund, had its initiation last year. The first annual report was put out by that organization recently. They are very proud of what is happening, and so are we as partners in this endeavour. I think we are beginning to establish and diversify wildlife toxicology research in the scientific community across the country. Research is not just being done within CWS, or in one or two private sector organizations. The universities are now quite involved and, as of 30 April 1986, 42 proposals were received for research, 24 were approved and many more are under consideration.

The Wildlife Colloquium has been the "bane" of many of us for the last 18 months in the sense that it was "on again and off again" several times. We were not quite sure exactly how it was going to turn out, but I think in retrospect that it was an overall success as a "think-tank" session where ministers of governments, chief officers of NGOs and interested citizens got together and put forward ideas about new approaches to wildlife management, and how we might be able to raise additional funds to help in this cause. David Munro will be reporting later on the outcome of that Colloquium, but I think it was a significant event. We hope that some of the ideas can be realized and put into action for the benefit of wildlife in Canada.

Looking a bit to the future, we hope to revise the Protocol to the Migratory Birds Convention. Also, we hope to be able to start drafting much needed amendments to the Migratory Birds Convention Act and the Canada Wildlife Act, if not this summer, certainly in the fall. We hope to be able to tell you also, later this year, that we are drafting a new Import, Export and Interprovincial Transport of Wildlife Act, which I gather has been in the wings for about 10 years, maybe longer, but is finally imminent.

We continue to work assiduously on wildlife matters associated with native land claims. As an example, earlier in June there was a significant event in the sense that broad consensus was reached on the principles of a wildlife co-management agreement between CWS and the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut in the Northwest Territories.

Partnerships needed

As I contemplate the future, I cannot see the Canadian Wildlife Service, with 300 person-years and $23 million more or less, continuing to stretch itself thinly across the nation, while trying to manage on many fronts, pleasing everyone and delivering results efficiently. The strategy for the future has got to be resolved through the greater use of partnerships with others interested and involved in wildlife management.

We are already doing some of this, but CWS is going to have to utilize this mode of operation even more so in the years head. We have to get even more involved with those who are interested in wildlife management, and we are going to have to devolve to locale organizations, groups, provinces and NGOs as much as we possibly can, without jeopardizing our Minister's accountability for the programs for which he is responsible to Parliament. I just wanted to let you know that we are going to continue to seek new partnerships, forging them in all shapes, sizes and forms, and that we are open for business.

Update report

US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

F. Dunkle
Director
(Delivered by H.K. Nelson)

As many of you have heard, we have a new Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Frank Dunkle, who was appointed on 8 May. He is a professional fish and wildlife manager, former Director of the Montana Game and Fish Department, a State Senator, more recently a member of the Secretary of the Interior's field staff, and 4 years with the Fish and Wildlife Service at our Regional Office in Denver, Colorado.

Conservation efforts

Since the last Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and CWS have been involved in a number of significant efforts aimed at conservation of numerous wildlife species and their habitats.

Indeed, Canada has taken a leading role in international conservation during the last year. In 1986, it will host the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources "World conservation strategy" meeting, and the International Ornithological Congress and International Council for Bird Preservation meetings. In 1987, it will host the Conference of Parties for the Ramsar Convention and the Convention on International Trade in Threatened and Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES).

Canada has kindly asked the United States to share in the benefits that can come to our hemisphere from a successful Ramsar Convention meeting. The 1987 Ramsar Conference of Parties will provide both Canada and the United States with an outstanding opportunity to work for wetland habitat protection in Latin America. This wintering area for important species of avifauna is in severe need of additional protection and management.

Within this realm, I note that the final session of your present meeting will examine the question of how to optimize world-wide wildlife conservation efforts. The United States recently examined this question with particular reference to the Western Hemisphere. We found that over half our migratory birds depend to some degree upon Latin American habitats. These same habitats are being degraded or completely lost at an alarming rate, with an associated loss in wildlife numbers.

The Fish and Wildlife Service is looking to a comprehensive training and education program in Latin America aimed towards developing a regional capability to help solve those ecological problems. This involves graduate-level university programs in wildlife and wildlands management similar to one recently established in Costa Rica in co-operation with the World Wildlife Fund. This is a model refuge where long-term, hands-on training can be conducted. Admittedly, this is a long-term effort, but for now appears the one most likely to optimize our investment of assistance in future years.

With that, I would now like to highlight some of the major efforts conducted by the USFWS, many in co-operation with CWS and certain provinces, during the last year.

"North American waterfowl management plan"

You have already heard considerable reference to this subject, and we will be addressing it in more detail at a later session. Joint signature of this plan on 14 May 1986 culminated an exhaustive effort between the United States and Canada to set waterfowl population goals and habitat requirements and to determine the actions required to achieve those goals. In general, the plan is a broad policy framework that describes the scope of requirements for management of migratory waterfowl in Canada and the United States.

Mexico's full participation is also a key to successful management of North American waterfowl, and both nations have agreed to actively encourage it. Implementation will be made through national, provincial, territorial, state and flyway plans related to the outlined objectives.

To this end, a North American Waterfowl Management Plan Committee will be established to monitor and update the plan, co-ordinate current work, and review new proposals and joint ventures. Federal, state, provincial, and territorial wildlife agencies will be represented on the committee. We hope this committee of 12 can begin functioning soon.

Initiative for waterfowl management and research

Like most of you, we also continue to experience budget and personnel restraints. The Gramm/Rudman/Hollings Budget Reduction Act of 1985 is a major current issue in the federal bureaucracy. However, there are also some positive things happening.

The President's Fiscal Year 1987 budget, recently submitted to the United States Congress, requested immediate steps to address the recent population decline of waterfowl in the United States. Current plans call for a $2 million increase in waterfowl production and habitat management activities in the Service's Fiscal Year 1987 budget. These funds will be used primarily in the prairie pothole region of the North Central States to improve waterfowl habitat on Service-owned lands and on private lands.

Increased emphasis will be provided to research efforts. An additional $3 million has been requested to develop ways to alleviate the downward trend of waterfowl populations in the United States. These efforts will include further determination of the impact of non-hunting mortality, developing improved methods for estimating waterfowl populations, and an increased capability to develop population models and data analysis.

Waterfowl population management

An analysis of data from the stabilized hunting regulations period is being completed this year in co-operation with CWS and other co-operators. We expect to have a report of results for general distribution by the end of December 1986. Results of the stabilized regulations studies and other information will be incorporated in a new "Environmental impact statement" covering the migratory bird management program in the United States for public review by June 1987. That document will articulate our harvest management philosophies, including any adjustments based on new information.

There is also a session on the stabilized regulations program scheduled for the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Quebec City in March 1987, chaired jointly by CWS and USFWS.

Black Duck management

This species continues to pose management problems to both countries. Winter survey results from 1986 in both the Mississippi and Atlantic flyways showed a moderate increase in Black Duck numbers from 1985 population levels. The Mississippi Flyway is currently 11% above the 1976-85 average, whereas the Atlantic Flyway is presently 5% below average for those same years.

While our currently planned harvest reduction program for Black Ducks will not end until 1988, and will be reported on in 1989, we intend to take a hard look at population status and harvest levels as soon as information is available for the past season. The next significant step on behalf of Black Ducks will be to attempt to initiate the joint venture called for with Canada under the "North American waterfowl management plan".

Mallard nesting success evaluated in Prairie Canada

The Mallard Duck has experienced declining population levels in recent years. Specific information on duck nesting success had been lacking from Prairie Canada. Research was conducted on 17 study areas across Prairie Canada during 1982-85. The study was carried out by researchers from the Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, with co-operation from provincial wildlife agencies, CWS and our office of Migratory Bird Management. This research was also part of a larger overall effort to understand Mallard population dynamics during the period of stabilized regulations.

Nest success for study areas ranged from 1 to 36%. It had previously been suggested that a 15% nest success was necessary to maintain stable Mallard populations--this value was not met in many study areas. Greatest production came from large tracts of grassland, many of which were owned and managed by federal, provincial or local government agencies. This co-operative study reiterates the need to preserve and manage wetlands and upland nesting habitat in both the United States and Prairie Canada.

Canada Goose management

We continue to have a number of Canada Goose management and research problems. These are primarily related to fall and winter distribution, and control of harvest for the Mississippi Valley, Eastern Prairie and Tennessee Valley populations. Canada Geese in the Atlantic and Mississippi flyways are being studied through the use of individually coded neck collars to learn more about patterns of migration, distribution, harvest and survival. Many of you are involved in these co-operative studies.

Specific studies on the Atlantic population involve the USFWS, CWS, Atlantic Flyway Council, Mississippi Flyway Council, and the Mavik Corporation representing native people living in the Canadian portion of the goose breeding grounds. Over 20 000 geese have been trapped, banded and marked during the past 3 years in the Atlantic Flyway alone, and more than 60 000 observations of these marked birds have been reported from states and provinces throughout eastern North America.

We are hopeful this work will provide new insights on population dynamics, seasonal distribution, and harvest of these populations of Canada Geese.

Lead shot ingestion by Canada Geese

The Eastern Prairie population of Canada Geese which breed in Manitoba, migrate through western Minnesota and winter in Missouri are, at times, exposed to lead through ingestion. A joint project by the USFWS, CWS, and provincial and state agencies within the Mississippi Flyway Council is under way to identify sites of lead exposure in order to more effectively manage this resource.

Geese will be trapped and banded, and blood samples drawn on their breeding grounds at Cape Churchill, Manitoba during fall migration in western Minnesota, and again on their wintering grounds at the Swan Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Missouri. The degree of lead concentration found in the blood of these geese will be analyzed to determine changes in rates of exposure to lead--both temporally and geographically. The results will be useful in improving local management of these geese to reduce exposure to lead shot and related mortality.

Whooping Cranes

The long-term co-operation between the United States and Canada in conservation of Whooping Cranes is another outstanding example of international stewardship. The "Memorandum of understanding", signed by former Director-General Tétreault and former Director Robert Jantzen in April 1985, further defined our co-ordinated management activities. Each nation appointed a staff member to co-ordinate the day-to-day implementation of management. We are revising our recovery plan. I understand that CWS is developing a plan for activities within Canada.

During the past winter, 97 Whooping Cranes arrived at Aransas National Wildlife Refuge on the Texas coast. The flock included 16 young-of-the year, a record for this century. The total North American population reached 165 birds, an 11-fold increase since the low in 1941. This year, 19 fertile eggs were transferred from Wood Buffalo National Park to the United States in late May: 15 to the Grays Lake project in Idaho, and 4 to the captive flock at Patuxent Wildlife Research Center at Laurel, Maryland.

A co-operative project conducted from 1981 to 1984 involved radio-tracking the Whooping Crane migration between wintering grounds in Texas and breeding grounds in Wood Buffalo National Park, Northwest Territories. Reports on different aspects of these studies are now being prepared by USFWS and CWS biologists.

"Operation Falcon"

The USFWS has, for many years, worked closely with the law enforcement officers of all the provinces and CWS. One major wildlife investigation stands out in the co-operative efforts of our two countries to stem the illegal trade in wildlife. "Operation Falcon" began in the United States in 1981 as a covert investigation aimed at reducing the illegal take, sale, and transfer of raptors. The Canadian investigation, centred in Ontario, began shortly after the United States investigation. By the fall of 1982, it became apparent that both investigations were not only aimed at the same species of raptors, but also involved many of the same defendants. From late 1982 through today, this has truly been a joint investigation.

On 29 June 1984, during a closely co-ordinated enforcement effort, over 300 law enforcement officers from Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta, the Yukon, 14 states and the USFWS served more than 70 search warrants on suspects involved in illegal commercialization of raptors.

Prosecutions have continued on the cases developed through "Operation Falcon". In the United States alone, 69 subjects have been charged, of whom 7 are considered foreign fugitives. The penalties handed out to date include more than $325 000 in fines, 3 years of jail time, and more than 73 years of probation. This investigation is on-going and additional charges are expected in Canada and the United States.

Acid precipitation

In the continuing spirit of co-operation, the USFWS and CWS met in December 1985 to discuss the impacts of acid precipitation on migratory birds and their habitats. Concern over declines in waterfowl populations impacted by acidic deposition has led to several field research projects in the two countries. This meeting ensured continued co-ordination of the research and scientific review of individual projects. Impacts on amphibians and research on metal accumulation and toxicity to birds and fur-bearers, as related to acid deposition, were also discussed.

A summary of 1985 research results indicates that:

(a) fish species distribution and abundance are affected by acidity in Maine lakes;

(b) fish from acidic lakes show sublethal stress as indicated by reduced bone mechanical strength and increased number of gill mucus cells;

(c) acidic waters can affect duckling growth and feeding behaviour; and

(d) amphibians show differences in tolerance to low environmental hydrogen-ion concentration, with some species being eliminated in the most acidic ponds.

The USFWS also began a 5-year program during Fiscal Year 1985 to study acid precipitation mitigation techniques. The purposes of this program are to develop mitigation tools to assist in the rehabilitation of aquatic resources already impacted by acidification, and to provide protection for sensitive systems that may be impacted in the future. The program centres around co-operative research projects in the states of Massachusetts, West Virginia, Tennessee, Minnesota, and New York. Collection of baseline data has recently begun. The mitigative technique of liming will be applied to the lakes and streams being studied, and physical, chemical and biological changes will be monitored.

Garrison Diversion Project, North Dakota

On 12 May 1986, the President signed the Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act of 1986. The act adopts most of the recommendations of the Garrison Commission and represents a compromise between competing environmental and development interests. The size of the project was also reduced further. Impacts to fish and wildlife resources, including national wildlife refuges and waterfowl production areas, will be fully compensated. Of particular interest, the reformulated project plan eliminates impacts on Canadian resources. No irrigation return waters will flow into Canada. Municipal and industrial waters supplied to the cities of Fargo and Grand Forks, North Dakota will be treated to eliminate any potential problems with biota. Thus, the reformulated plan now meets the requirements of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

International Joint Commission areas of environmental concern

The International Joint Commission (IJC) has identified 42 areas of concern where contaminants or pollution have degraded the waters in harbours, estuaries and connecting channels of the Great Lakes. USFWS biologists are serving on an international committee, sponsored by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, to furnish guidance to the IJC on how fisheries should be protected. All participating agencies are providing data on fish populations and contaminant levels in the areas of concern.

Contaminants on refuges

In May 1986, the USFWS issued a final report entitled "Preliminary survey of contaminant issues of concern on national wildlife refuges". The report identified nine of the country's 434 national wildlife refuges as having documented contaminant problems, and another 76 refuges where there are suspected or potential contaminant problems requiring more in-depth study.

Effects of contaminants on waterbirds in the Great Lakes

Results are available from the first year of research conducted on the effects of industrial contaminants on colonial nesting birds in the Great Lakes. Evaluation of contaminant residues in the eggs of 21 colonies of Common Terns from industrial and municipal areas in all five Great Lakes indicated elevated levels of industrial contaminants.

Our field office at Green Bay, Wisconsin documented reproductive impairment in the Forester's Tern from very low levels of dioxins, furans and PCBs. They also observed gross deformities in cormorants.

Grizzly bears

The USFWS continues to work closely with the states and private conservation organizations to assist recovery of threatened grizzly bear populations in the Lower 48 States. We have concentrated on six areas in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho: Yellowstone, the Northern Continental Divide, Cabinet-Yaak, Selway-Bitterroot, Northern Cascades, and the Selkirks. Congress directed the Service to prepare four studies which are all now completed or nearing completion. A formal recovery plan will be released by the Service by the summer of 1987.

Beaufort Sea oil development

The USFWS will continue to co-ordinate its efforts with CWS regarding resource management protection and research efforts and oil development in the Beaufort Sea.

As an example, this summer the two agencies will participate in an oil spill clean-up demonstration in the Canadian portion of the Beaufort Sea.

Co-operative studies on polar bears in the Beaufort Sea

Co-operative studies on polar bears are on-going on both sides of the Canadian-Alaskan border by the USFWS, CWS, the Northwest Territories Wildlife Service, and the Yukon Territory Department of Natural Resources. Radio tracking and capture results have confirmed that the United States and Canada share the population of polar bears occupying the Beaufort Sea.

Although no formal agreements exist, the jurisdictions involved have followed the spirit of the International Agreement for the Conservation of Polar Bears, which mandates that shared populations be managed by consultation. We expect that this co-operative spirit will continue in the coming years as people's activities continue to affect polar bears in this resource-rich region.

Woodland caribou

The Southern Selkirk Mountain herd of woodland caribou was "emergency" listed as endangered in 1983 and listed "final" in 1984. Before the listing was completed, however, a number of agencies recognized the need for management of the herd if it was to survive. Therefore, the International Mountain Caribou Technical Committee was formed by the British Columbia Forest Service, the British Columbia Fish and Wildlife Branch, the US Forest Service, the USFWS, the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, the Washington Department of Game, and the University of Idaho.

The committee developed a co-operative management plan which outlined the various actions necessary for the survival and recovery of the caribou, and that plan is now being put into effect. Priorities of the plan include studies of the population dynamics of the species and its habitat and food requirements, the studies which will eventually lead to increasing the herd and establishing an additional caribou herd. Those of you from that part of the country are familiar with this effort.

Ecology of the Selkirk Mountain caribou herd

Since 1984, the Service's ecosystem studies section at Fort Collins, Colorado has been conducting research on the ecology of endangered Selkirk Mountain caribou in northern Idaho and southern British Columbia as part of a co-operative project with the British Columbia Game Branch, the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, the US Forest Service, and our Office of Endangered Species. The section's major research is concentrated on early winter habitat requirements and caribou genetics. During the winter of 1986-87, other agencies will be translocating caribou from British Columbia to Idaho to bolster herd numbers and reduce potential inbreeding.

Porcupine caribou herd

The Porcupine caribou herd migrates between northeastern Alaska and the Yukon and Northwest Territories of Canada. This species has been the focus of research directed towards increased understanding of range use and determination of long-term energy costs of migration. Both the USFWS and CWS have provided logistic and financial support.

Co-operative research conducted by the Yukon Game Branch, CWS, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the USFWS has successfully produced a satellite tracking system for the Porcupine caribou herd. The system provides daily data on animal location, activity, movement, and survival. This information, combined with remote-sensing data on weather, land cover, terrain, and habitat, is under analysis to define population limiting factors, habitat requirements, critical movement patterns, and migration corridors. Research results are already guiding land and caribou management policies regarding petroleum development and the international Porcupine caribou herd agreement.

All parties have moved closer to the point where an international management regime for this shared resource can be negotiated. Technical level meetings between federal, provincial and state officials have resulted in framework language on matters that our policy makers can consider for inclusion in an agreement. A United States position on joint management is very close. It is hoped that formal negotiations will begin this summer.

Piping Plover

The Piping Plover was listed on 11 January as threatened in the northern Great Plains, the Atlantic coast of the United States and Canada, and in wintering areas in the Caribbean and Mexico. It was listed as endangered in the Great Lakes watershed of the United States and the province of Ontario. We believe this species offers outstanding opportunities for co-operative conservation programs involving both our countries. These efforts to provide for recovery of the Piping Plover would be primarily focused on the protection and enhancement of existing migrating and nesting habitat.

Bald Eagle recovery

In 1983, the Canadian-United States co-operative Bald Eagle project started. That year, 22 eagle chicks from Nova Scotia, Manitoba and Saskatchewan were translocated to New Jersey, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, as part of an effort to restore Bald Eagle populations in the eastern United States. Through the 1985 breeding season, a total of 81 eagle chicks have been shipped from Canada in support of restoration efforts on behalf of our national symbol, and efforts are presently under way to continue translocating eagles from Canada to the United States in 1986.

This is truly a program of mutual benefit to the United States and Canada, and one in which we take great pride. The individual states receive Bald Eagles for their restoration programs and, in turn, provide staff support and funds to the provinces donating eagles to assist in their eagle production surveys and banding efforts.

We look forward with great anticipation to the 1988 breeding season. This will be the first year that translocated Canadian eagles reach breeding age, and we fully expect to find some of these transplanted eagles establishing new territories in previously unoccupied habitat in the eastern United States.

Fisheries

As you know, we also have a varied fisheries program in the USFWS. I realize that this is primarily a wildlife conference and, to save time, I will ask those of you who are interested in specific items to direct your enquiries to the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Update report

FORESTRY/WILDLIFE WORKSHOP

M. Mogford
Deputy Minister
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

It is my pleasure to bring you up-to-date on the planning for the Forestry/Wildlife Workshop that is a follow-up to the British Columbia session held in May 1984. I assure you that the planning for this workshop is proceeding well.

The Steering Committee that has been formed includes Tim Millard, Executive Co-ordinator of Outdoor Recreation; Ken Armson, Executive Co-ordinator of our Forest Resources Group; Monte Hummel, President of the World Wildlife Fund Canada; and Joe Bird, President of the Ontario Forest Industry Association.

Involving practitioners

During the planning for this session, it became obvious that the basic concepts of integrated resource management are known and accepted by both the Ontario government and the forest industry. Our most pressing need is to involve the practitioners of timber management in evaluating everyday practices and problems, and arriving at acceptable solutions to integrate the management of our resources.

Ontario's greatest challenges in this respect lie in the boreal zone of our northern forests. For this reason, we have decided to aim the conference at field-level foresters, biologists and technicians working in this area. Of course, the forest industry must be strongly represented at this workshop if it is to be successful.

To encourage the dialogue necessary to learn from the experience of these people, the number of attendees will be limited. There will be room, of course, for representatives from some of our most concerned interest groups and also from each province and territory.

The components of the presently envisioned program include sessions on what we know about the habitat needs of some of our important boreal wildlife, a review of the Ontario management system, examples of actual logging operations, and workshop sessions to produce recommendations for actual implementation or future study. So, as you can see, our ideas are starting to take some form.

Planning teams

Before I say anything more about the workshop itself, I would like you to be aware of a closely related important development in integrated resource management presently occurring in the province of Ontario. Some comments were shared with you last year about our intentions, so what follows can be considered an update.

The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources has proposed a preparation and review process for undertaking "Timber management planning and operations" in Ontario. Multi-disciplinary planning teams of Ministry of Natural Resources staff will be formed at the local level to guide, review and amend if necessary the 5-year operating plans put forth by timber companies. The teams will ensure that timber management activities provide for other forest uses and users. In this way such values as wildlife, fish and tourism are protected. The process also requires that opportunities be provided for public review and comment during the plan approval stage.

Although our staff have incorporated many additional resource-related concerns into past timber management planning, this concept is now being finalized and formalized. Our timber management planning has long been evolving in this direction, but we have been spurred on recently by the fact that Ontario's timber operations on Crown land will soon come under the requirements of our provincial Environmental Assessment Act.

Because of the intense public interest in this matter, we in Natural Resources have volunteered that our proposed timber management planning process should itself undergo a full public hearing under the Environmental Assessment Act. At present, it is expected that this hearing will begin in late 1986 or early 1987 and continue for perhaps 6 months. The hearing will involve, of course, many of the same people, both inside and outside government, who have a role to play in our Forestry/Wildlife Workshop. That is where these two come together and why I am sharing this with you in some detail.

Postponement

Because of the timing of this very important hearing, and the heavy workload for all parties involved in preparing for and participating in the hearing, and because none of us have been through a public hearing under the Environmental Assessment Act before, it has unfortunately been necessary to postpone the workshop again. At this time we expect it to take place in late 1987 or early 1988. We regret having to do this, but frankly, if we are to have a successful workshop, we cannot handle it at the same time as the environmental assessment hearings.

As you can perhaps appreciate, it is a busy and exciting time of opportunity for those people in Ontario concerned with ensuring the wisest use of our forests.

The Forestry/Wildlife Workshop, which will take place, will continue the worthy goal of trying to translate our good intentions into on-the-ground practices to better protect and manage all the resources of our forests. When the date of the workshop and the agenda are firmed up, we will notify you. I hope that some of you will be able to join us.

Update report

WILDLIFE COLLOQUIUM

D. Munro
Naivasha Consultants

The Wildlife Colloquium was held on 7-8 May. It arose from a Toronto meeting in January 1985 of the Ministers responsible for wildlife. There were several reasons for proposing that the Colloquium be held. One was that there had been some concern arising from the reduction of funding for the Canadian Wildlife Service; at the same time, the concept of the "North American waterfowl management plan" with its prospects of additional expenditures was being discussed. There was a general feeling that it was time to look at the options for wildlife conservation action and at ways of funding the activities necessary to achieve conservation.

I suppose you could say that the purpose of the Colloquium, as it arose from that meeting in 1985, was to see that the level of wildlife conservation activity in Canada was sufficient to ensure that necessary wildlife habitat was being maintained and that species were being used sustainably. I am putting it in those terms to link it to the "World conservation strategy" which, of course, has become a fundamental basis for most conservation activities in Canada. More specifically, the purposes of the Colloquium were to propose and to examine new methods of management, new sources of funds and new arrangements that might achieve conservation more effectively.

The Colloquium was attended by a good mix of wildlife people; Environment Minister McMillan attended, as did Ministers from four provinces and the Northwest Territories. There were officials from all the provinces and territories. Two members of parliament attended, as did representatives of non-governmental organizations and other elements of the private sector, including people from the business community.

The presentations to the Colloquium included some very stimulating ones. Barry Turner, MP, outlined his proposal to adapt the idea of an excise tax on outdoor equipment and materials to the Canadian scene. There was a very interesting keynote address by Peter Pearce, Professor of Forestry and Forest Economics at the University of British Columbia, who has a wide background in resource management. He has been the head of a Royal Commission on Forestry in British Columbia, has examined fisheries in that province, and recently concluded an investigation of federal water policy. David Perry of the Canadian Tax Foundation gave his viewpoint on the practical implications of additional taxes being levied to support conservation. These and a number of other very useful papers provided a very good background for the discussion which, was in turn, informative and stimulating.

Management and planning

I believe that the conclusions reached by the Colloquium were significant. A particularly important conclusion was that, because of the economic and recreational values of wildlife, existing management programs should be maintained and supported by present sources of funding. In other words, new funding should not be used for programs now on-going; the status quo must be maintained and we must build from that base.

Participants recalled that, almost 5 years ago, guidelines for a wildlife policy had been prepared, debated by all concerned and agreed to by Ministers. With 1987 as the 5th anniversary of the issuance of those guidelines, it would then be time to review them and decide whether or not they were serving the public purpose.

Stimulated by the address by Peter Pearce, there was discussion about looking for opportunities to manage wildlife to yield a direct economic return; one reason for doing so being that it might thereby be possible to come closer to determining a market value for wildlife. We all know that one of the difficulties in wildlife management is that of placing values on wildlife that are comparable with the values of competing interests that we have to deal with. It was suggested that, in some of the native communities, there would be good opportunities to contribute to a better understanding of market value through experiments with commercial use, and it was noted that this was beginning to take place.

Another general conclusion of the Colloquium was that integrated planning and management of the use of land and all other resources was a basic necessity for good management of wildlife. It is interesting to note, from what Mary Mogford has said about resource management in Ontario, that significant steps are being taken towards integrated planning and management of the use of forest lands. That there will be a requirement for an environmental assessment of the impact of certain forest management practices is a very significant and practical step in this direction. I understand, as well, that there are similar management trends in New Brunswick, so there is progress being made in this area.

Discussion of specific additional needs in wildlife conservation and management centred on three areas:

(1) an enhanced program for the maintenance and management of wildlife habitat, including particularly the "North American waterfowl management plan", which was a well-advanced concept and would require substantial additional resources;

(2) the requirement to accelerate research basic to wildlife management in certain areas was recognized, and the establishment of co-operative fisheries and wildlife research units, such as have existed in the United States for at least three or four decades, was proposed; and

(3) improving efforts to educate and inform by maintaining and expanding a system of ecological interpretation centres should receive additional support. The foregoing are activities for which additional funding is required.

New funds sought

A good deal of attention was, of course, given to the possible sources of new funds. The one that captured the most attention was the proposal of an excise tax on outdoor equipment and supplies. Other possible sources of additional revenues were seen in increases in users' fees, the possibility of income tax check-offs, conservation shares, conservation bonds and so forth. It was believed that all of those possibilities were very much worth further in-depth exploration.

Finally, the opportunities for more productive collaboration among governments, between governments and industry, and between governments and non-governmental organizations, were discussed very fully. It was agreed that there would be much benefit from expanding the scope of such shared programs as Tony Clarke mentioned earlier, and that all possibilities should be examined more carefully.

I believe that the Colloquium was a successful event; the discussion and the atmosphere were good, but I do not think that you can render a final judgement of a meeting of this sort immediately after the event. It is necessary to suspend judgement until some follow-up has been decided upon, and it is possible to see whether you can trace significant new action to such a meeting. We will not be able to do that for a little time yet, but I think it is important that the follow-up be defined fairly soon.

With respect to follow-ups, the Colloquium concluded that a task force should be appointed to pick up the conclusions of the Colloquium and examine them in more depth and make substantive recommendations to Ministers. I understand that discussions are going on now which should lead to the appointment of such a task force within the near future.

Update report

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK

K.A. Brynaert
Executive Vice President
Canadian Wildlife Federation

Twenty-three years ago, the Canadian Wildlife Federation (CWF) was requested to undertake a co-operative effort on behalf of this body. Our task was to produce classroom materials on a cost-recovery basis for distribution by all wildlife agencies. Our purpose was to provide an annual educational package for educators to use to highlight the Week. I believe it is fair to state that this initiative was taken because all agencies associated with this meeting recognized, firstly, the value of promoting wildlife education within schools, and secondly, the mutual benefits to be derived from volume printing and distribution.

It is interesting to note that annual distribution rates of these kits were in the 150 000 to 200 000 range throughout much of the first decade of our involvement. For the past several years, however, we have witnessed an alarming decline. This year, we hit a record low. Only 68 000 kits in total were distributed. Although the lack of a French program partially accounts for this low figure (Quebec has developed its own wildlife week materials), one is forced to raise the question: why the decline? It is a question which I pose to this body.

Easy target

It may be argued that fiscal restraint policies have affected the ability of wildlife departments to properly co-ordinate a Wildlife Week program within their respective jurisdictions. Thus, as a cost-saving measure, it is an easy target because the program is often erroneously perceived as "outside" normal activities. Or, as one agency had stated a few years ago, the success of the program is self-defeating--a demand for wildlife resource materials is created as more educators become aware of the program, and thus a department must make these kits available to a wider audience of educators. Both arguments are not acceptable.

Apart from a handful of truly outstanding initiatives taken to achieve educational objectives during the Week, we as a group have, in my view, progressively failed to take full advantage of it. If it is our goal to make a meaningful impact during Wildlife Week, then we must all be prepared to respond with a greater degree of commitment and involvement.

National Wildlife Week offers a unique opportunity to promote wildlife concerns and to encourage educators to convey our message on a massive scale, both within and outside of formal educational institutions. It is through these educators that we can reach the students and help make them aware of wildlife resources and their problems, at relatively little cost to agencies. Instead of taking full advantage of this tremendous opportunity every year to communicate, most agencies have cut off their options. We should be seeking ways to increase--not cut back--distribution. Our priority clearly should be to address as many educators as possible, not just one or two per selected school and grade level as is often the case. It is essential that we aggressively market our Wildlife Week program well in advance to prepare educators for it, so that interest is stimulated, participation is encouraged and more benefits can be derived.

The CWF is seriously concerned about the faltering status of the Wildlife Week program. In addition to diminishing interest in ensuring its effective delivery, we are faced with added burdens because of inconsistent support by wildlife agencies.

This year, two provinces once again did not participate--Saskatchewan and Quebec. Saskatchewan cited financial problems. The province of Quebec, on the other hand, has commenced developing an independent program which features different topics and, last year, different dates. This has occurred in spite of our request to work closely with the province to ensure that language requirements would be met. The lack of interest in participating in a co-operative program, which is under the auspices of this body, created a situation where the CWF could not produce an economically viable French-language kit this year. Some jurisdictions were simply not willing to share in the cost. The lack of identical French and English materials barred participation in the case of New Brunswick. As a result, the entire program suffered and was rightfully subject to criticism by French-speaking communities. Materials in both official languages are critical to the overall success of this program. It is vital that we seek solutions together.

I might tell you that at our recent annual meeting of just one week ago, by a unanimous resolution of our Board of Directors, from this point on, all National Wildlife Week material will be produced in both official languages whether we sell one unit or 100 000 units. It is our hope that all jurisdictions will fully support us in ensuring widespread distribution of French-language materials.

Level of involvement

Although I have expressed a number of these concerns and apprehensions repeatedly over the past several years, I honestly believe that the time has now arrived when we ask each jurisdiction to closely examine its own level of involvement and look for ways to improve performance.

This is a process we at the CWF have already started. As a result of our evaluation related to the kit, we have made drastic changes to format and style. Our purpose, of course, was to produce material which would be more desirable and of far greater value for educators. This year's effort was clearly a success. We did a survey of teachers, and over 90% of respondents highly praised our program, 86% had applied the unit prior to or during the Week, and 95% had stated that they would retain the kit for future use. The "Together, we can help wildlife" unit was unquestionably one of the best we have produced to date.

Apart from these activities, we are also looking at other ways where we can take the lead. Our purpose is to generate a greater focus on the program on a national scale both in the short and longer term. Our desire to stimulate positive action and support is based on our deep commitment to ensuring that the National Wildlife Week program will remain viable. As we prepare for next year's centenary celebration, we encourage all jurisdictions to take this opportunity to substantially increase efforts.

Next year's package will focus on "Wildlife conservation in Canada". We intend to ask our patron, the Governor General, to convey a special message to commemorate the event. We will also be asking for your co-operation to work with us and launch a co-ordinated program of festivities throughout Canada similar to the outstanding efforts we witnessed in some jurisdictions this year. It is our hope that the impetus this provides will serve to heighten involvement and set new precedents to follow in future years.

I would like also to briefly discuss plans for 1988. We have two topics which we place before you for consideration. One proposal is to develop a unit devoted entirely to endangerment. Although this subject was incorporated in part into the past year's effort, educators have expressed considerable interest in receiving classroom materials related to this topic. We gained this information as a result of the survey that I mentioned earlier. Our alternative proposal is to develop a unit on toxic pollution and its effect on wildlife resources. There is no question that toxic contamination of our soil, air and water is fast becoming a very serious and high-profile issue. We have already experienced a surge of demand for materials on this subject, and thus are convinced that such a unit will be needed for classroom use in the near future.

Before closing, there are two things I would like to mention. In 1985 this body addressed itself to the proposition of communicating about wildlife, and I can recall some of the words spoken by people like Michael Halleran and many others that really challenged us to do a better job of communicating. I would suggest to you that, in my view, National Wildlife Week is a golden opportunity. It is an example of a co-operative program between non-governmental organizations and federal and provincial jurisdictions. The fact that we do not have greater support for this program is, I think, rather a sad comment.

Award winners

Finally, I would like to announce the National Wildlife Week award winners. The national winner is Angela Maureen McKinnis, aged 13, grade 8, from Inuvik, Northwest Territories.

Those who received honourable mention are: Derick Mercer, Gander, Newfoundland; Karen Keith, Kinkora, Prince Edward Island; Lisa McCarthy, Woodville, Newfoundland; Shamus Armstrong, Frobisher Bay, Northwest Territories; Jason Nolan, Rivers, Manitoba; Adam Aylworth, Northwest Territories; Jeffrey Barnes, Newfoundland; Sarah Kamananiuk, Yellowknife, Northwest Territories; Kerry McGrath, Northwest Territories; Koto Futur, Habour, Nova Scotia; Tony Walker, Onaway, Alberta; Shane Kellman, Edmonton, Alberta; and Garry Leckie, Orangeville, Ontario.

You might just think about those award winners and where they come from because it is certainly a clear indication, in my view, of those who have put a substantial effort into Wildlife Week. If you would like further confirmation of that, I would suggest that you take a look at some of the award winning posters and school projects that we have provided for the poster session, because I think they convey a lot of good information on the potential effectiveness of our National Wildlife Week program.

(continued)

Summary of Discussion

H.A. Clarke (Canadian Wildlife Service) agreed that National Wildlife Week presented a golden opportunity to influence and shape the minds of young people. He said that they would be talking some more about this for 1987.

Member of audience (unidentified) was very impressed with the comments on Wildlife Week, and claimed to be one of the educators who had not done as much as they could, perhaps. The speaker found a problem in differentiating between Wildlife Week and Environment Week--they were both quite close together, it was very difficult--and asked if Mr. Clarke could enlarge on the difference between the two, and how they could get the difference across to people.

H.A. Clarke said that his understanding was that National Wildlife Week was declared by Parliament back in the 1940s. He thought Environment Week was of a more recent origin. Obviously Wildlife Week was focused on wildlife, and Environment Week more generally in terms of the environment as a whole. Clearly there was some overlap. This was creating some slight difficulties, he said, within his own department (Environment Canada) as to where they should focus. The focus on National Wildlife Week was something that they, as wildlife managers and people who were interested in wildlife, could make better use of. He was not terribly concerned about duplication. He happened to like National Wildlife Week; he was out in Alberta during it, when the Alberta Museum had done a tremendous job. Penny West, Gordon Kerr's Executive Assistant, had boasted to him that for $150 she was able to get CWS on the air every morning of Wildlife Week. The Museum really did a tremendous job--30 odd exhibits and thousands of people. Maybe there was a message in there for some other public institutions.

F. Drolet (Quebec Wildlife Conservation Branch) said that he wished to make a simple comment on what Mr. Brynaert had said about Wildlife Week. Firstly, Mr. Brynaert had pointed out that New Brunswick had lacked eductional material in French, and this could have posed a problem for some of the population. He wanted to tell New Brunswick, and other provinces that might be interested in the subject, that Quebec would be happy to supply them with teaching material that they had produced for the Week. This was varied teaching material addressed to every primary and secondary level, and even to the college level in one section. He believed that this would interest some of the provinces.

He also wished to mention that, for their Week, they had issued not only material in French, but this year in English and even, in the previous year, in Spanish, intended for the public, on the occasion of the International Festival of Sailing Ships held in Quebec. So, they were very open-minded on this subject, and their publications were not solely in French.

H.A. Clarke thanked Mr. Drolet very much for his offer of help, and said he was sure that Ken Brynaert and the provinces would take him up on his offer.

D. Munro (Naivasha Consultants) wanted to make a comment, as an individual, with respect to the matter of National Wildlife Week and generally with respect to education and information. He did not know how many meetings and conferences he had attended in his life, and could not think of very many of them that did not eventually reach the conclusion that the difficulties that they faced in trying to manage the environment effectively, and trying to achieve conservation, were largely due to either lack of political will or a failure to convince the public of the importance of the sorts of concepts that they were trying to promote. It all came down to the same thing--a lack of understanding, a lack of conviction--and it was repeated time and time again, and they all knew it just as well as he did. And yet, somehow or other, they failed to mount the sorts of programs, to design the sorts of activities, that would convince people in a way that would lead to their taking effective action. He was sure that they had been through the same sort of mental process with respect to this issue as he had; they all knew that this was correct, and yet somehow they did not manage to do it, but got wound up in the technical difficulties of their job. They failed, somehow or other, to do the sorts of things that were going to convince people.

He was saying this, he continued, to try to generate a little more excitement about this topic than he sensed was there. They seemed to be sitting there somewhat inertly, and did not seem to be responding somehow to the issue that was facing them. He wanted to reinforce Ken Brynaert's suggestion that they go and look at the posters. If they looked at them carefully, he thought that they would find them exciting. They reflected what kids had absorbed when they had had the good fortune to have a teacher who somehow picked up this program and imparted to them some sort of information and some sort of interest. If they looked at the classroom projects, they would be very impressed with what had been picked up from this. It was important. It was the only way to go. He asked for a little more enthusiasm about it.

H.A. Clarke thanked him for those challenging remarks. Actually, it was quite simple, he said. They were in a business. If they were in the private sector, they would be developing their clientele very actively. How could a business exist without a clientele? They were missing a very significant target group, but he supposed that it reflected to some extent the fact that they were in government. They could not be in business without developing their clients.

Ramsar update (1)

GLOBAL DEVELOPMENTS UNDER THE RAMSAR CONVENTION

A summary

D. Navid
Head, International Relations, IUCN

The Ramsar Convention, formally known as the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, should have a great deal going for it. It was the first modern global nature conservation treaty; it remains the only one which is dedicated to the conservation of selected ecosystem types and of the species dependent upon them, and it is predicated upon the promotion of international co-operation for nature conservation, rather than the confrontation that has characterized certain subsequent international conservation arrangements.

Unfortunately, the Ramsar Convention has also suffered from important inherent deficiencies which have prevented it from reaching its full potential. Some commentators feel that the Convention should have "more teeth"--more stringent provisions, and therefore more stringent conservation requirements. A more significant problem with Ramsar, however, in my opinion has been the absence of administrative provisions. Indeed, in 1980, the "World conservation strategy" assessed the Convention by noting: "Experience has shown that an international Convention must have a (permanent, secure) secretariat and a financial mechanism to be effective, but the Wetlands Convention lacks both". Furthermore, when adopted, the Convention did not have an amendment procedure, which has frustrated efforts to address its deficiencies. Another serious problem has been the presence of an unfortunate final language clause establishing English as the only authentic language, thereby posing a serious political difficulty for participation by certain states, French and Spanish speaking countries in particular.

Fortunately, the Contracting Parties have recognized the utility of the Convention and are taking steps, albeit slowly, to remedy the administrative difficulties I have just described. I think that we can be fairly confident that by this time next year, following the Third Conference of the Contracting Parties (to be held in Regina, Saskatchewan on 27 May to 5 June 1987), amendments to the convention will have been adopted which will put all these difficulties behind us.

Background

The Ramsar Convention was adopted following a series of international conferences and technical meetings mainly held under the auspices of the International Waterfowl Research Bureau (IWRB). It entered into force in late 1975 upon the deposit of an instrument of ratification by Greece, the seventh state to do so. At present, the Convention has 41 Contracting Parties throughout the world and, as will be noted later on, many more states are expected to join in the near future.

The Secretariat is provided by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). We are assisted in this task by the IWRB as scientific adviser. Unfortunately, due to the lack of an administrative basis, there is no financial mechanism to support all of the work that we would like to see done under this Convention; neither IUCN nor IWRB has been able to provide as extensive services to the Convention as we would have wished. The governing body of the Convention, the Conference of the Contracting Parties, meets periodically to review developments under the treaty.

The broad objectives of the Convention are to stem the loss of wetlands and to ensure their conservation in view of their importance for ecological processes as well as for their rich fauna and flora. To meet these objectives, the Convention provides for general obligations relating to the conservation of wetlands throughout the territory of the Contracting Parties, and for special obligations pertaining to those wetlands which have been designated in a "List of wetlands of international importance". As a result of these provisions, the coverage of the Convention extends to a wide variety of habitat types including rivers, coastal areas and even coral reefs.

The three main obligations of the Contracting Parties are:

(1) to include wetland conservation considerations within their national planning to promote wise use; the Contracting Parties have interpreted this "wise use" requirement to mean the maintenance of the ecological character of wetlands;

(2) to designate wetlands for inclusion in a "list of wetlands of international importance" maintained by IUCN; criteria for selection, with the greatest relevance to importance for waterfowl, were adopted by the Contracting Parties at their 1980 conference, and it is intended to adopt certain additions to these criteria at the Regina conference to better cover other wetland values;

(3) to promote the conservation of wetlands in their territory through the establishment of nature reserves; this applies to wetlands whether or not included on the list.

Ramsar in practice

Of all the aspects of the Convention, the "List of wetlands of international importance" has attracted the most international attention. In practice, the Contracting Parties have gone far beyond the mandatory designation of only one site; as of June 1986, some 335 sites covering approximately 20 million ha have been designated for the list; furthermore, no site has been deleted from the list and replaced by another.

Although most Contracting Parties have designated wetland sites on the basis of their importance for waterfowl, other faunal and floral interests are being taken into consideration. Canada's use of the Ramsar list has been especially impressive with currently some 17 sites, in excess of 10 million ha (half the world's Ramsar area), having been designated.

We know that the Contracting Parties find membership in the Convention to be useful in stimulating their countries' interest in wetland conservation, and in helping to prevent detrimental changes to sites included in the list. But, despite the values perceived by the Parties, it became clear a few years ago that the structural, administrative problems under the Convention had to be remedied if it was to fulfil its potential for global co-operation.

Eventually, in December 1982, an Extraordinary Conference of the Contracting Parties in Paris adopted a protocol providing for the needed amendment procedure and for the additional official language versions of the Convention. This Protocol will enter into force this autumn. In the meantime, the Contracting Parties have been working towards the elaboration of the required administrative regime. A Task Force was established to develop recommendations for the Contracting Parties on future secretariat requirements, the text of necessary Convention amendments, fixed Rules of Procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties, and the need for a Standing Committee to act on behalf of the Parties in between meetings of the Conference.

The next Conference of the Parties, which is being generously hosted by the Government of Canada and the Province of Saskatchewan, promises to be the largest, most ambitious and certainly the most important Ramsar meeting to date. If all goes as planned, the Convention amendments recommended by the Task Force should be adopted, including:

- more structured arrangements for regular Conferences of the Contracting Parties;

- the authority for Conferences of the Parties to adopt financial provisions to provide resources for the organization of meetings, the operation of the Secretariat, or for other purposes;

- the authority for Conferences of the Parties to create subsidiary bodies or adopt other decisions, and the establishment of a permanent, secure Secretariat to perform a range of necessary functions.

We also hope at the Regina Conference to have lively discussions in a variety of workshop settings on various aspects of wetland conservation. In addition, there will be a particular focus upon wetland conservation needs and requirements in the Western Hemisphere.

Membership

We now have the situation where almost every developed rich country in the world, both north and south, is a Party. Coverage is excellent in the Western Palearctic, but the Western Hemisphere is a particular problem, with only Canada, Chile, Suriname and Uruguay involved. (Mexico has joined since the presentation of this paper.) It is anticipated that, with the emphasis being given to Western Hemisphere co-operation at the Regina Conference, this might change. Also, the fact that the Protocol will enter into force and provide us with an official Spanish-language Convention text will be an extremely important impetus. Possibly most significantly, the United States signed the Convention in September 1985 and its ratification is expected before the Regina Conference. In addition, IUCN and IWRB have recently been in contact with many states which have indicated their intention to join the Convention soon.

But one of the main questions we hear is: why should developing countries join Ramsar? What is in it for them? There are many international conservation programs and initiatives available. These things, in one way or another, cost money; they require time and effort which many developing countries believe they cannot afford. Indeed, as noted above, the present membership in the Convention is largely made up of the richest, most industrialized states in the world, where dramatic habitat losses have underlined the need for wetland conservation. Yet, it is in the developing countries that some of the world's most important wetlands can still be found, where it is not too late to conserve them, and where the "north's" migratory species winter. Increased involvement in the Ramsar Convention by developing countries is essential for real international co-operation in this field.

In fact, in addition to the need to help developing countries conserve their own natural heritage as a basis for sustainable development, it can be seen in one regard that "your" birds are going somewhere else and, if there is no co-operation for conservation, "your" birds might not come back. So the Ramsar Convention is a mechanism for co-operation between the rich and poor, between the north and south, for the important issue of wetland habitat conservation.

At the Groningen Conference, a "Framework for implementation" with specific "action points" for co-operative project activities was adopted. One action point called for the establishment of a clearing-house to link developing countries seeking development aid for wetland conservation projects with aid agencies in the developed world. This idea will be the subject of a special workshop at the Regina Conference. There have been some examples of co-operation in this regard, between the Netherlands and Mauritania, Norway and Mali, and we hope between the United Kingdom and India, for co-operative wetland conservation activities under the Ramsar Convention. We understand that co-operative programs by the USA and Canada with several Latin American countries might also be highlighted at Regina.

To conclude, I believe that it is safe to say that the future is indeed bright for the Ramsar Convention. At a time when confidence is eroding in more and more intergovernmental arrangements, we can actually see that involvement and interest in the Ramsar Convention is climbing. Ramsar, the first modern global nature conservation convention, is indeed receiving increasing international support. With the leadership provided by Canada at the next Conference of the Parties, we can look forward to the Ramsar Convention "taking off" to reach its full potential for fostering global co-operation to ensure the wise use of wetland areas.

Ramsar update (2)

THE RAMSAR CONVENTION - CANADA

A summary

D.S. Morrison
Executive Vice-president
Ducks Unlimited Canada

The Ramsar Convention, more correctly referred to as the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, was convened by the Government of Iran early in 1971 at Ramsar, Iran. It was sponsored by the International Waterfowl Research Bureau and co-sponsored by FAO, UNESCO, International Biological Program, IUCN, ICBP, World Wildlife Fund and Conseil Internationale de la Chasse.

The primary objective of the Convention is to reduce the rate of loss of wetlands worldwide and to ensure the conservation of those wetlands which are internationally significant. To those countries which are signatory to the Convention, it provides the framework for international co-operation by placing general obligations on those countries to conserve wetlands throughout their territory, with special emphasis on those that have been designated as "wetlands of international importance".

Exchange of information

Currently the Convention has approximately 40 countries which have acceded to its terms, and to date some 300 sites in excess of 20 million ha have been designated for the "List of wetlands of international importance". Each site so listed must meet certain minimum requirements in order to be recognized as internationally important. Once a wetland is so listed, any change to its status or environmental characteristics must be conveyed to IUCN, which functions as the Convention bureau.

The contracting parties meet periodically to discuss national experiences, to review the status of sites on the list, to promote co-operative activities and to hear reports from international organizations on subjects relevant to the Convention.

UNESCO serves as the depository for documents of accession to the Convention, as well as all documentation relevant to the listing of sites. Through this process, member states have found that the exchange of information, the precedence for wetland conservation established by other countries, and the "friendly persuasion" of being associated with a community of conservation-minded countries have played a role in stimulating the development of wetland conservation policies which are technically sound and politically palatable.

An additional, if somewhat informal, role that the Convention has played to date is in linking developing countries which are in need of development aid for wetland conservation with those countries where help might be available, either in the form of financial or technical assistance.

Canada's role in Ramsar

Canada acceded to the Ramsar Convention in January of 1981 with the listing of the Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area. Since that time, 16 additional sites have been designated and are in the process of being added to the "List of wetlands of international importance". The total of 10 million ha, including three sites on provincial Crown land, form the single largest designation to the Convention to date.

The Convention will be highlighted in Canada in 1987 with the meeting in Regina, Sask., 27 May to 5 June, at which time it is hoped that an additional, very substantial list of important wetlands will be named as candidates for the "List of wetlands of international importance".

We think that initiatives with regard to Ramsar should be closely tied in with the identification and conservation measures planned for priority wetlands in Canada. The two initiatives, Ramsar and the "North American waterfowl management plan", should be mutually supportive and reinforcing to each other to obtain maximum conservation impact. To this end, it is critically important that the provincial and federal governments, along with participating non-governmental organizations, communicate closely in developing their initiatives in these two areas.

We in Ducks Unlimited view the Ramsar Convention as a much needed additional tool to preserving wetlands in Canada. There are many important wetlands in Canada where management, in the traditional sense that we are used to, is not possible or desirable, but where simply protection is required from alienation for other uses. In this sense, individual wetlands which are accorded the special importance of internationally significant wetlands are given a measure of security which could not be provided otherwise. If the public, too, is made aware of the international importance accorded to some of our wetlands, this will have a substantial impact on the way our society views these important components of our environment.

We view the 1987 Regina Ramsar meeting as an excellent forum for naming a significant number of new Ramsar sites and for heightening awareness within Canada of the need for increased wetland conservation measures. Furthermore, with the right type of publicity, this meeting could be used to recognize some of the substantial efforts under way or already achieved in the field of wetland conservation in this country. The Ramsar Convention is worthless if it is unknown. On the other hand, it can be a vital tool in helping us accomplish the job in this country and elsewhere in the world if we make the Canadian and international publics aware of its existence and importance. This was discussed by the Board of Wildlife Habitat Canada, and they share some of these views about making sure that we get good publicity relative to the Ramsar Convention.

I would really like to see other non-governmental organizations support this, and hopefully all the provinces and the federal government. I also hope that we will pass a recommendation at this meeting urging all provinces and the federal government to take the opportunity of the Ramsar meeting in Regina in 1987 to declare additional Ramsar sites and increase public awareness of the value of wetlands.

Ramsar update (3)

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

M. Smart
International Waterfowl Research Bureau (IWRB)

I would like to support what the two previous speakers have mentioned. It is clear that Canada has really played a leading part in the development of the Ramsar Convention. The meeting next year does offer a terrific opportunity for publicity within Canada, and in a small way for giving examples to other countries.

My first thought, when I heard the discussion of last year's resolutions, was that this present conference could well formulate a resolution to the Canadian government, provincial governments and NGOs in Canada that would act as a sort of reminder that we have done quite nicely in the past, but that we could still do other things in the future. What made me think this was that IWRB held one of its annual meetings in Canada at Edmonton a few years back. It was on that occasion that Canada added, I think, 14 new sites covering 10 million ha to the Convention list. Canada is the biggest shareholder by far in the Ramsar Convention list.

I recall that at the last meeting in the Netherlands, their Minister of Agriculture's first gesture on opening the meeting was to list their Wadden Sea, which is one of the biggest estuarine areas in Europe, under the Convention. So it would be a nice gesture if there could be some similar sort of announcement made at the Regina meeting.

Another point worth recalling is that, at that same Edmonton meeting of IWRB, quite a big project was established with Canadian, US and DU support, and subsequently WWF support, to draw up an inventory of wetlands in South and Central America, to act as a sort of shadow list or guideline to South American and Central American governments that might like to join the Convention. That publication is coming out this month, in English and Spanish. I am sure it is going to have a terrific "spurring-on" effect to the countries concerned. It is something which Canada can rightly be proud of--getting that thing going.

Finally, another thing that might be mentioned in this resolution is that these Ramsar sites--the 330-odd that have been listed--show that countries take different approaches in the kinds of wetlands they list. Some governments have been a little bit cautious, saying that they would only list sites which had full national park status, or of which they had total control in their own country. That is one way of doing it. Others have been a little more adventurous and have said they would list sites that did not yet have full statutory protection in their country, because giving them a little international label was a spur to getting on with the national legislation. That is what Canada did, I think, in the case of Delta Marsh and some others. Sites which were not previously afforded national protection or provincial protection were listed under Ramsar.

That has acted as a locomotive to get the other national protection legislation through. I think it would be worthwhile in a resolution to mention that. I hope that sites listed would not necessarily already have all the full panoply of national wildlife refuge or national park status, but there should be some sites that are in a little difficulty, and it would give them a push forward to get them through. I would have thought that both nationally within Canada and internationally it would be quite helpful if some kind of resolution on those lines could be formulated by this meeting, and could then be given publicity in other countries as a reminder to them of their obligations in the approach to the Regina meeting.

Ramsar update (4)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

M. Hummel (World Wildlife Fund Canada) said that it had always seemed to him that whereas Ramsar did provide some additional protection for wetlands that had already been protected in one way or another, it did not necessarily provide more wetlands for protection. He had been concerned that the time and energy spent on listing wetlands that were already protected by a national government did not detract from the other job, which was protecting more wetlands.

D. Navid (IUCN) replied that he was not quite sure that he had the complete answer, but thought this was what their Dutch colleagues were driving at when they said that they felt that the wise-use requirement of the Convention was clearly the predominant thing as far as they were concerned.

The Convention, he continued, would spur this development towards the consideration of wetlands nationally as an important element, but they should not put all their eggs in one basket. The Ramsar listing was perhaps the most glamorous portion of the Convention. It had been extremely important in gaining an acknowledgement by the people and the government that certain areas were important, and it had afforded them protection. On the other hand, if they were talking about international importance regardless of what kind of criteria were used, they could not cover all the wetlands or even, probably in many countries, a very large proportion of the wetlands. He felt very strongly that the two aspects had to go hand-in-hand.

A major element of the Regina Conference would be a workshop on the whole question of wise use. Case studies had been solicited from various countries throughout the world, for example, from Mexico and Tunisia. There would be a presentation from the FAO about fisheries and wetland conservation. They would have a wide range of presentations, and it was intended that some sort of resolution might be adopted by the Parties indicating how they would go further on this question of wise use and what would be encompassed within it. He thought they needed some sort of balance between the two for the important areas, and hoped this would be discussed very thoroughly at the Regina Conference.

D.S. Morrison (DU Canada) said that he shared Monte Hummel's concern that they appeared to be just shuffling the deck in many cases, but he believed that for the long term the additional designations of Ramsar were important. It was one more reason for not destroying something down the road. But he would like to see more of the wetlands that were possibly in more danger put in. He also wanted to re-emphasize the point that they were not using Ramsar, in his opinion, as effectively as they could in terms of publicizing the value of wetlands and the fact that they had some of the most important wetlands in the world right there in their own country.

R. Orenstein (International Wildlife Coalition) gave it as his experience, in talking to various people involved in conservation, NGOs and other groups, that the public awareness level of even the existence of Ramsar was pretty low. Since Canada's role in Ramsar had been as a leader, and it was something that Canada could take considerable pride in, he thought that a lot more could be done, while they were in the process of educating the public about wildlife conservation efforts in Canada, to give it that international link and tie in with Ramsar.

To him, what had always been one of the biggest concerns vis-a-vis Ramsar was the very small number of Parties in the New World. He said he would be interested in knowing some specifics as to what Canada was doing now to encourage accession to the Treaty by various Latin American countries, particularly those who also shared the flyways and migratory habitat of their own birds. He would be interested in seeing consideration given as to whether or not Ramsar might not well be amplified by Canada considering accession to two other international treaties which also dealt with shared co-operative efforts for the protection of habitat for species of animals, particularly migratory ones, these being the Pan-American Convention and particularly the Bonn Convention. If accession to these treaties was not possible, he thought the concept of the Bonn Convention, in particular, in which the parties were asked to form subsidiary bilateral agreements to protect designated species, might be a concept applicable in some way to Ramsar, at least conceptually, if not in a specific form. He wanted to know some specifics of what Canada was doing in the course of its international negotiations vis-a-vis Ramsar, and if Mr. Navid perhaps would have some comments on the other agreements just mentioned, which he thought could be of some importance to Canada.

D. Navid replied that he could not speak with any authority about what Canada's intentions might be. There were many opportunities, and in fact much was being done to try to use the conference next year to arouse public awareness or to increase it about the Convention. One thing that he had not mentioned was a brochure which they had produced in English, French and Spanish versions. The best thing would be to see if they might find a way to produce sufficient numbers and get those out in Canada and elsewhere. They had had some pretty good feed-back about those brochures, which provided general information about what the Convention was.

Regarding the other conventions that had been mentioned, he thought there was a problem that they had faced with Ramsar. There were many international instruments floating around out there, and countries were finding it difficult to participate in all of them or to afford the cost of all of them. Some of the conventions certainly very well complemented each other, and he understood that in certain parts of the world there was an effort under way to try to utilize some of the existing agreements to reach the objectives that perhaps all of those conventions were after. It might well be that some of the aspects and the objectives of the Bonn Convention could be realized through the Ramsar Convention. In main part, the Bonn Convention would involve the conservation of migratory birds, and the Ramsar Convention, in main part, could protect some of their most important habitats, so there was a clear linkage. It was not a perfect fit by any means, and countries in other parts of the world, especially in Europe, were finding it desirable to participate in both of these. There was another convention to complicate matters a little bit further, the World Heritage Convention, which in fact also could provide significant conservation benefits to sites which might be Ramsar sites or might be the habitat of migratory species under the Bonn Convention.

It was a concern to many governments, he added, and to indeed many conservationists how these all fitted together. They felt that the Ramsar Convention had a tremendous leg-up now on the whole issue, especially in relation to the Bonn Convention, because of the fact that they had had this amount of action, and had a sufficient number of parties now. Because of the nature of the provisions of the two conventions, it could be used to achieve many of the objectives of Bonn. In a perfect world they would like to see countries belonging to as many instruments as were necessary to properly conserve species.

H. Boyd (Canadian Wildlife Service) said that the question of why Canada had not joined the Pan-American Convention or the Bonn Convention was very much out of the hands of CWS and Environment Canada. It had to do, in the case of the Pan-American Treaty, with a longstanding desire by Canada to remain separate from a linking organization. In the case of the Bonn Convention, the difficulty arose particularly with respect to marine resources, where the Canadian position, and that of a number of other countries, was that the Convention would be more of a nuisance than a help. He thought it rather unlikely that Canada would become a signatory to the Bonn Convention.

On the other question of what Canada was doing to stimulate membership in Ramsar among other countries in the Western Hemisphere, he thought that at the diplomatic level it was not very much, because they had concentrated, in their Latin American program, on developing an extensive network of contacts and collaborators. For example, in the work on the "Wetland directory",which Mike Smart had referred to, it was believed to be more useful in most cases for the will for signature to come from within a country rather than be imposed on it. Their approach had been very much a soft one up to now. He supposed that their IWRB meeting in Edmonton in 1982 was the occasion when they had really decided that Canada could and would get involved in encouraging wetland conservation in other parts of the Western Hemisphere. They certainly had no intention of backing away from those efforts.

Update report

"WORLD CONSERVATION STRATEGY": WHAT IT COULD MEAN TO CANADIAN WILDLIFE MANAGERS

H.K. Eidsvik
Parks Canada and IUCN

The 50th anniversary of the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference is an occasion to celebrate and assess; to look at your past and to your future. My mandate in this assessment is to look at the "World conservation strategy" (WCS) and what it could mean to your organization.

The launching of the WCS in 1980 marked a significant turning point in the history of the conservation movement. Thirty nations participated in the launch, and recently some 80 countries were represented in Ottawa to review progress on its implementation. Dr. David Munro was the Secretary-General of the conference and has agreed to pinch-hit for me on questions which might be specific to that conference.

The WCS veers away from IUCN's traditional view of conservation as a moral imperative, or a counterbalance to development. José Furtado, who is the Chairman of IUCN's Ecology Commission, described the traditional approach as:

> a rearguard movement, saving pristine landscapes, untouched ecosystems or habitats and rare species from the relentless onslaught of development. The task of the conservationist was to muster as much influence as possible to counterbalance development which, while regarded as a necessary evil, had to be prevented by conservationists from "going to far". Second, and related to the above, conservation had a strong moral content. It embraced the notions of respect for nature and of the duty of man to protect it in the interest of future generations. Species and habitats were to be saved not because they offered a potential for resource development such as a cure for cancer or a guarantee of a viable irrigation system--not even because "they were there"--but because it was a moral imperative not to destroy what nature had created. (Furtado 1986).

That was the vision of IUCN before the WCS hit the market place.

Furtado went on to say,

> Conservation as it is now understood has not abandoned totally the traditionally Western views, but has widened the scope considerably and in so doing has changed its perspective. Conservation still embraces preservation, and sound conservation action can, in many cases, mean a strong and active opposition to development. However, conservation and development are no longer regarded as separate and opposing issues. The "World conservation strategy" defines development as "the modification of the biosphere and the application of human, financial, living and non-living resources to satisfy human needs and improve the quality of human life"; and conservation as "the management of human use of the biosphere so that it may yield the greatest sustainable benefit to present generations while maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of future generations". What is immediately evident is that conservation and development work with the same ingredients: development, by and large, is predicated on the transformation of natural resources for human needs; and conservation is concerned with managing

that process of transformation in the interest of long-term sustainability. (Underlining added). (Furtado 1986).

When conservation is seen to be management in the interest of long-term sustainability, I would expect that it comes much closer to the views of wildlife managers than has the more traditional concept of preservation that we have known for so many years.

In essence, the "moral imperative" for conservation is retained, but the Strategy begins the process of bringing a more scientific approach to the massive task of conservation. So, we see a shift in values, linking conservation and development under the three major objectives of the Strategy:

- maintenance of essential ecological processes,
- preservation of genetic diversity,
- sustainable use of species and ecosystems.

These objectives, I assume, are all common fodder for the wildlife manager.

Methodologies

The Strategy is in essence a philosophy. Implementing the Strategy was what the Ottawa conference was about--as someone said, "Developing a strategy for the Strategy". In so doing considerable emphasis was given to the development of methodologies, such as:

- national conservation strategies,
- regional or provincial conservation strategies,
- local conservation strategies, and
- sectoral conservation strategies.

We have seen considerable action in Canada in this direction. We find the Public Advisory Committees of the Environmental Council of Alberta, for example, developing an "Alberta conservation strategy". In the Northwest Territories, in the Task Force on Northern Conservation, we find the definition taken from the WCS as a basic direction for conservation futures in the North. On the national scene, we see the Government of Canada with a document called "World conservation strategy - Canada", which is really an update of what is being done across the country and is in no way a Canadian or a national conservation strategy. At the world level the work goes on, and implementing the "World conservation strategy" has been a major aim of IUCN's conservation program since 1980, and certainly will be going on into the future.

The wildlife policies produced through this Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference in 1980 and 1981 must be one of the earliest uses of the WCS as a "planning tool". From this we can clearly see that the implementation of the WCS comes about primarily through local action--building from the bottom up--guided by a philosophy which is global in nature.

I have some notes from last week's Conference on conservation and development. In them we find another perspective, one that disappointed many people when they looked at the first WCS draft. Missing elements suggested a need to focus on observed shortcomings of the existing Strategy and what could be done about them. There were many people who felt that IUCN had ducked the big questions on key issues.

Key issues included "Population and human settlement" (which is really not dealt with in the Strategy at any length), the "Economics of sustainable development" (so far, as conservation people, we have not reached the politicians, the economists, the members of the economic councils who are making decisions about future investments), and finally we get questions such as "Sustainable development and peace". All of these are issues of major consequence to IUCN's constituency and certainly a concern at the baseline level for all conservationists. I still find myself falling back and talking about protected areas, national parks and wetlands, and there are lots of people working on population, so I tend to step back from that and say, "That's too big for me, so I will leave that for others to deal with".

Supporting life

Turning now to the question of wildlife relationships, I am struck by the use of the term "wildlife" in Zimbabwe, where it is used as two distinct words--"wild and life". They separate the two words very strongly, and it becomes interesting because you can look at such things as development and conservation, stressing the need to focus on LIFE as a pre-condition to focusing on the WILD. It is clear, and we see this globally, that without adequately fed, clothed and sheltered people, the wild will not survive. We need only look at Haiti where, because of shortages of every type, the environment goes downhill. We have seen it in the Sahel, dramatized in Ethiopia. The Strategy stresses the role of "wildlife" in supporting life. If we do not have those natural systems functioning, we see both life and the wild go down the drain. The Conference noted that we had not done enough about integrating wildlife values into the mainstream of our societies. So that was a large concern at that meeting.

Since the early exploration of this country, life has had a dependence on wildlife. The beaver, the seal, the caribou are still central to the life of many Canadians. If a document such as the WCS had continued and confirmed an expression of preservation and traditional morality as the only foundation to conservation, I would suggest that this conference would be faced with a more difficult task in selling questions of the conservation of wildlife within government policy. The fact that the "North American waterfowl management plan" and the Wetlands Convention can be linked to the "World conservation strategy" provides positive linkages for decision-makers and demonstrates the value of broad frameworks for planning purposes.

In the Strategy, specific sections focus on wildlife species or habitats. Section 2.11 deals with wetlands, which are mentioned again in section 15.13, which touches upon the Ramsar Convention. With the July 1987 Wetlands Conference to be held in Regina, we have a good example of the Convention and the Strategy at work in Canada, and this is an opportunity for Canadians to get involved in implementing the WCS.

Returning to the Strategy, section 3.11 deals with threats to species. The linkage to the Canadian scene is demonstrated by the work of COSEWIC which is, of course, a reflection of governmental and non-governmental groups in action. Closely related to many of these activities is, of course, the role of CITES. Many of you view some of these as totally negative, and some as reinforcing your activities. I think there the question becomes one of working with those instruments we have and making sure they do a good job for us. All of these are elements of conservation strategies.

As might be expected, section 4, dealing with sustainable utilization of species and ecosystems, incorporates an extensive section on wildlife resources and habitat.

I do not believe it is necessary to elaborate further on the Strategy to demonstrate its relationship to Canadian wildlife issues. I would just like to suggest that our constitutional structure sometimes makes it difficult to involve and integrate provincial wildlife management agencies in the on-going work of monitoring something like the WCS. I can only urge that you look upon the document as one relating specifically to your province, and not as a document relating solely to the federal government. Looking at it from a provincial perspective, you are looking at land and water areas much larger in magnitude and in importance than many nations which are in the process of implementing the Strategy.

In its 50 years, the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference has provided leadership in wildlife conservation. Perhaps the conservation strategy is a vehicle through which you could better make your contribution in aid of world conservation in the future. Your 1980 and 1981 policies already reflect this intention. The key now is to continue implementation. Policies related to Canada, the Northwest Territories, Alberta or the "North American wildlife management plan" all become guidelines for other nations, and thus by doing a good job at home we contribute also to the world scene.

References

Environment Council of Alberta. 1986. An outline for the Alberta conservation strategy - Prospectus. Environment Council of Alberta, Edmonton.

Environment Canada. 1986. World conservation strategy - Canada. A report on achievements in conservation. Ottawa.

Furtado, J. 1986. In Selected papers and abstracts - "Conference on Conservation and Development: Implementing the World conservation strategy". Ottawa.

Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1984. Task Force on Northern Conservation. IAND, Ottawa.

IUCN *et al*. 1980. The World conservation strategy. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

IUCN. 1985. Implementing the World conservation strategy, IUCN's conservation programme. IUCN Series 1/1985.

Keynote speech (1)

CANADA'S ROLE IN WORLD WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

S. Bata
International Trustee
World Wildlife Fund

(Geneviève Sainte-Marie, Deputy Minister, Environment Canada, introduced Mrs. Bata.)

Your theme for this conference, "Canada's role in world wildlife conservation", could not be more appropriate at this time. The world has become more interdependent and more exchange of information is needed.

World interdependence became very clear at the time of the oil crisis. In recent months, when the Chernobyl accident happened, it became even more dramatically obvious that we all live on the same planet--the dying forests of Europe, the acid rain in North America, the built-up of CO_2 in the atmosphere, in industrialized as well as developing countries, and the pollution of the seas, are no longer just growing risks, but they are facts which need solutions and co-operation.

I am not a scientist, nor an academic. My interest in environmental issues originates from two areas. In the early 1970s, as Chairman of the National Design Council, I became deeply involved in establishing the total life-cycle costs, direct and indirect, of products and systems. At that time, we also did some work on how human behaviour was influenced by man-made environments and the impact of noise and visual pollution, as well as air and water pollution. I became convinced that the protection of the natural environment must become a priority.

My second interest came through the World Wildlife Fund (WWF). Since 1971, I have been doing a fair amount of lobbying for the Fund in various parts of the world, particularly in the developing countries. Because of my business interests, I have been visiting Third World countries on a fairly regular basis, and I always try to combine my business visits with calling on some of the heads of states or government ministers to talk to them about conservation in general and specific WWF projects. I was involved in "Project Tiger" in India, rain-forest projects in Indonesia, and the vicuna debate in Peru.

Deterioration in Africa

I would like to share with you now some of my experiences in Africa where, as an eye-witness over the last 40 years, I have seen the degradation of the environment, not so much because of natural disasters, but by human mismanagement. When I visited Africa first in the late 1940s, it was a rich continent. Most people were illiterate and did not wear shoes, but I do not remember seeing starving people, though we travelled widely all over the continent.

At the beginning of this year, the United Nations Office for Emergency Operations in Africa published figures which showed that, in 1985, $2.9 billion US was raised to try to help famine and drought victims in Africa. They believe that they were able to spare the lives of 20 to 30 million people and help another 10 million who were uprooted from their homes. The number of people who died, probably in the hundreds of thousands, or even millions, are not known; 200 million people in 20 countries affected by the drought face a difficult and uncertain future according to the report.

What happened in these 40 years to bring about such changes, and why is it so important to find long-term solutions for the African problems?

We can not afford not to take an interest. The importance of the Third World countries to Canada, and in fact the whole world, should not be underestimated. It is expected that by the year 2000, when the world population is estimated at 6.1 billion people, 80% of the population will be in developing countries, which will also have 20 of the 25 cities with over 10 million inhabitants. It is important for us that, besides the humanitarian aspects, these countries should become prosperous and stable. Economically we need to translate their needs into markets. Canada needs exports, jobs to employ its people. It is in our interests to try to help these countries to be economically solid and politically stable.

We have an enormous amount of expertise in Canada, and hopefully we can find ways and means to share our expertise with the world. There is a high respect and appreciation for Canadians. This is not only because Canadians sometimes do a really good job, but also because they do not consider us to be a colonial power. Indeed, we were a colony ourselves at one time, and also we are not big enough to act as a big power.

Long-term plan

Let us face the challenge of how we can avert these types of disasters in the future. The aid programs, trying to save people, do not teach people what they should do next time. In fact, they sometimes even produce a certain dependency on foods and accommodation which are foreign to them.

What is necessary is to work out a long-term plan. From Biblical times it has been known that in Africa there are periods of seven lean years and seven fat years. Historically we are aware of migrations. We can expect that these will happen again.

What made it so much worse this time was that there was a background of fundamental deterioriation in the balance between population, ecological capacity and economic growth. The population growth over the past years had outstripped food production in 36 of the 41 sub-Saharan African countries. Overall per capita food production has diminished by 2% since 1970, the last year when Africa produced as much food as it consumed.

The dramatic increase in the level of both human and animal populations has placed horrible pressures on the fragile ecological systems in many of the arid areas of Africa, turning once-productive lands into deserts. Disproportionate amounts of land and resources have been committed to increasing cash crops for exports while the peasant farmer, who is the basic producer of food, has been starved of the kind of support and incentives required to stimulate food production.

Thus, even before the current drought, Africa's dependence on food imports was growing rapidly to the point where almost 25% of the total population of these countries had become dependent on imports. To use Tyler's statement: "Nature's bank had been overdrawn". He describes it as "environmental bankruptcy".

In the Sahel region, the relentless march of the deserts, destroying what once were vast tracts of arable land, will be difficult to stop. Even the drilling of new water-holes does not seem to work, as too many people and cattle gather around them and then the earth has no time to recover.

How did it happen and so quickly? One of the reasons that this deterioration was allowed to happen is that many of the new, independent governments in Africa did not consider agriculture to be of importance. They thought it more prestigious to use aid money for large macro-projects--power stations, steel mills, and unfortunately, frequently also such things as national airlines, palaces for the heads of states--in the case of Nigeria, even a new capital. The donor nations were keen to sell their products. Today, the worst off are the countries which are oil-rich, because they started rather carelessly to spend the money which they thought would come in for ever and ever.

Population and agriculture

What can be done? On top of the list of the priorities which need to be dealt with in Africa are the high levels of population growth. The only program I have seen which seems to work well at the moment is in Thailand, where Mr. Mecei ("Mr. Condom") started a few years ago a program that really has become popular with the population. Being a Thai himself, he understood how to handle the cultural problems of birth control. He helped to educate people not to be embarrassed, but to take birth control in their stride, by organizing road shows, "condom carnivals" and birth-control festivals.

In Africa, the problem is gradually being considered to be a priority. In Kenya, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Kibaki, was given special responsibility for it, but as in many other countries, it is a cultural problem. Children in many African countries mean wealth because they work the land, and it is difficult to understand why a family would not want to be wealthy. The Kikuyu in Kenya usually have two wives, and it is against their culture to ask a man how many children he has.

The second priority must be very massive support for peasant agriculture. We must find ways to increase local food production and improve the quality of rural life. Productivity must be ensured on a sustainable basis, trying to avoid the ecological break-downs. This means a quantum increase in education and training, particularly geared to the needs of the rural economy. Self-sufficiency must be the target.

In several countries, for example India, the "green revolution" really worked on the small scale as well as the large scale. People still burn dung for cooking, but the fact is that India today is self-sufficient in wheat. It was obviously a combined effort of international research, Indian government officials and the local farmers willing to co-operate.

I am told that in Africa, if agriculture is handled properly, the turn-around could be achieved in a relatively short time (in some areas). Research, teaching, improvement of breeds and crops, prevention of deforestation and overgrazing are essential.

Today, African governments are aware of their problems. The time is now to offer advice and help. The top priority should be to convince governments of the importance of introducing national conservation strategies. I believe that the initial work done by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) is extremely valid, but progress is slow. There are only a few of the developing countries that so far not only have accepted the theory of a national conservation policy, but have actually done anything to implement it.

Probably the first country where we will see some actual results is Zambia, because of the personal interest of President Kaunda. Last autumn, I had an opportunity to visit Zambia, Zimbabwe and Kenya. In all three countries, I saw the heads of states and tried to push the "World conservation strategy". Kaunda and Mugabe had been briefed and seemed to be sympathetic. In Kenya it might take a little longer. In all African countries, for programs to be truly effective, it is essential that the head of state is personally involved. There is not a single real democracy in Africa. All of the countries are one-party states, and very frequently the best civil servants are absolutely paralyzed if they do not get support from the top.

It is essential that government departments in Africa start working together, pulling in the same direction, instead of implementing fragmented, non-related projects.

I believe that Canadians can play an important role at the professional level to help with the building blocks of the Strategy. In my discussions with the heads of states, they mentioned several areas of the Strategy which are of very special importance to Africa.

Education

In Africa, 80% of all cooking is done by collecting firewood. Flying in small aircraft over the countryside, one realizes how much the countryside has changed. Vast areas have been turned into waste land. President Moi (Kenya) started a presidential tree fund and there is a lot of tree-planting going on. The problem is that the educational program to retrain the women to use other cooking methods is not progressing well. In my opinion, the education of the women has been badly neglected. Few women understand why they should experiment with the other methods of cooking--be it the cooking chest or bio-gas or solar heat. If one could organize women into voluntary organizations it might help, but this has not happened so far.

Some hope comes from the various youth organizations that are now teaching conservation, be it the Wildlife Clubs of Kenya or the Chongololo Clubs of Zambia.

This brings me to the next subject which is part of the "World Conservation strategy", the education of the people. There is an urgent need to involve local people and educate them so that they can understand the issues. This needs to be done at two levels. There are not sufficient skilled and professional people in the countries. More programs to establish environmental schools in Africa, more training centres for game wardens are needed. At the same time, exchange programs, which would enable some of the bright people of Africa to study outside and bring their knowledge back, should be accelerated.

Again, Canada can do a tremendous job in this particular area.

Another area which is particularly close to you is the question of wildlife and park management. There are many parks in Africa, but most of them badly managed, the wardens badly armed. Poachers are a real problem. Canada has an excellent reputation. They all want help. As you are probably aware, there are some very interesting projects going on, particularly in Zambia and Zimbabwe, where poaching has been a tremendous problem. By now involving the villagers around the park, they hope to overcome some of the problems (Mwenezi Project). The villagers have become part-owners of the game and benefit from any organized culling that is going on in the park. In these areas there is a surplus of elephants. The elephants are culled by separating a whole family. Their meat is cut into strips and dried in the sun and provides a lot of protein for the population. One of the problems is that the hides of the elephants are still not properly used. By the time they arrive in the tanneries, they usually have rotted because of a lack of salt. But progress is being made.

Another interesting development in Zimbabwe is the increase in game farming. Mr. Mugabe explained to me, in a rather outspoken way, that cattle and wheat were brought in by the colonialists, and whilst it was possible up to a point to improve the breeds to withstand local conditions, they did want to do much more research on how native species could be bred and harvested, and more native plants could be used for their food production.

Again, this is a whole area where Canada could be deeply involved.

Co-operation with industry

I firmly believe that there also could be very much better co-operation with industry, not only as far as raising funds is concerned, but also in implementing programs.

I saw a typical example of this type of co-operation last November in Mombasa, which is known as the "Bambura nature project on baobab farms". The Portland organization has a very large cement plant that today is surrounded by abandoned limestone quarries, which had become a desert of splintered coral rock and silica without a trace of organic substance, and where, due to the nearby Indian Ocean, the salinity of the fossil groundwater is very high.

Portland hired a Swiss agronomist by the name of Rene Haller to try to develop a reforestation program. Haller is a rather unusual scientist, and I believe that many colleagues are critical of some of the work he is doing. The fact is that he has succeeded in creating forest areas over a relatively short period of time in previous deserts; one of the most impressive things that I have ever seen. Today the reforestation project encompasses about 300 ha. Haller started the reforestation by planting small seedlings, mainly casuarina (equisetiflora), in cylindrical plastic soil bags, which are left so that the roots will have to grow down instead of horizontally where the heat would dry them out.

The reason for the tree's remarkable ability to grow, without organic substance and nitrogen, lies in its symbiosis with a number of unique micro-organisms living in its root systems. The casuarina trees grow very quickly with little water. When they started to drop their needles, Haller introduced red-legged millipedes, which are common to the area, to feed on the dried needles. Their droppings, deposing with the help of compost bacteria, formed the first crumbles of soil. Afterwards grasses, bushes and certain species of animals were introduced to create a new ecosystem. Today the area has become a green forest, and they have actually established a nature trail which is quite popular with the local population. They also established a game farm and have two herds, one of oryx and the other of eland.

In addition, Haller started a tilapia fish farm. He uses round tanks for his fish farms, and forces the fish all to swim in the same direction. By doing that, he has overcome some of the territorial problems, and when I visited the farm the fish certainly seemed to look very healthy. By sorting the fish he does get a lot of waste, which he uses today to feed crocodiles on an adjoining crocodile farm.

Haller's whole theory is to use common sense on how a forest grows without the introduction of chemicals. By identifying the micro-organisms and specific species, he builds up an ecosystem which seems to interact.

Today the "Bamburi nature project" is not only self-financing but makes money. His work was widely written up in German and Swiss newspapers. I believe that many industries would be willing to organize similar schemes and put up front-end money if they were convinced that at one time these schemes would become self-financing.

Some suggestions

To conclude, let me just list a few suggestions on how Canada could help world conservation:

(1) Aid programs should not concentrate so much on macro-projects, but put a high priority on sustainable food production and agriculture.

(2) All aid programs should have an environmental assessment factor.

(3) Environmental and conservation programs should be accepted as part of the economic development programs of a country. Canada also should play a role in convincing some of the large financial institutions, like the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, to follow this principle.

(4) More research and better transfer of knowledge on how to create sustainable balances of ecosystems are needed on a regular basis, particularly soil conservation, reforestation, land reclamation, and innovative means of combating drought and desertification. This includes also a wide variety of other activities from research on species to help in improving metereological and climatic forecasting.

(5) Accelerated educational programs. Education is a key at all levels:

  (a) in management courses for park management and wildlife management, an area where Canada is known for its leadership;

  (b) for professionals in the environmental fields, be they researchers or game wardens;

  (c) for schools, to teach conservation principles;

  (d) for rural people, taking into full consideration their own needs.

In all these areas Canada can and should play an important role. Let us make our country an example of how it can be done and help other people to do the same in their own way. The world is expecting it from us.

Keynote speech (2)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

R. Orenstein (International Wildlife Coalition) mentioned that he was recently involved with the Canadian Environmental Law Research Foundation in the preparation of a study, under contract to CIDA, on methods for drawing up environmental standards to be applied to the granting of aid, and the consideration of aid projects. He said he was not certain what the current status of that study was in the CIDA process, but hoped that this was a sign that they were now beginning to think more seriously about the environmental consequences of Canada's aid programs.

He added to that a concern that was voiced very widely at a conference he had attended in San Francisco last year, at which they had founded the Rain Forest Action Network, a group of organizations interested in doing what they could to help stem the loss of tropical rain forest. At that conference, it was pointed out that the individual aid-granting policies of countries such as Canada were only part of the problem as far as granting aid. One of the major problems was the funding by large multilateral organizations, such as the World Bank, of some highly damaging projects such as the Transmigration Project in Indonesia. It was insufficient for a country like Canada to incorporate environmental concerns in its own aid policies, in its own internal management policies, if it was not prepared to carry the same standards to its role as a voice in the multilateral agencies to which Canada contributed. This was an important additional feature that must be brought out.

He wished to make a further comment in relation to Canada's position, and this was partly going back to the previous speaker's comment on the "World conservation strategy", suggesting that lobbyists, among which he supposed an organization like the one he was representing would qualify, would not be happy with the shift in emphasis that the WCS had made. He wanted to correct that impression. The moral viewpoint, the moral arguments, for the preservation of nature had not given way in the face of a realization that, in many places and in many areas, more pragmatic, economically viable methods must be used to conserve wildlife and their environments. The point was that the "World conservation strategy" supplemented those views by realizing that they could not simply set aside pristine areas and let the rest of the world go the way it was and expect that things were going to stay that way. Pristine preservation, where possible, had not been supplanted as a viable option by the WCS, it was merely one of a continuum of options that were required.

They could get too carried away in Canada, he continued, by looking at what was happening in some of the sub-Saharan countries, such as Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, where people were living on the edge and had very little choice as to what they could do with their environments. Fortunately, they were now adopting strategies which he hoped would help them, such as the ones Mrs. Bata had described. In Canada, they had much more leeway, because they were not in that kind of an economic condition, to apply broader standards, long-range standards and indeed moral standards to their considerations of how they treated their environment. He believed that for Canada to look at some of these other countries and say, "Aha! The preservationist ethic, the ethic of a John Muir, of people like that from the past century, is dead because it won't work in sub-Saharan Africa," was no excuse for those who were fortunate enough to live in a country where they did not need to make every last inch of their environment pay its way, to attempt to say that they themselves could be bound by those same standards. They were in a position to set a technological example to the world, and a management example to the world. He believed they could also set a moral example to the world.

S. Bata (World Wildlife Fund International) agreed that the Canadian situation was very different from the African situation. What she was advocating was that Canada should be a shining example of conservation management, because they had the people who could do it. They had the space and still had vast areas which could be protected. She hoped that they would give an example to the world of what a country could do.

Referring to mention of the World Bank and the fact that they had been financing projects in countries, including Indonesia, she said that she could mention some others that were really detrimental to the environment. A rather strong lobby was needed to convince the World Bank that there must be an environmental assessment in their projects, and not only that, but that they even could look at environmental and conservation projects as economic projects. One heard how many billions were paid for the famine, and it would be great to get that type of money to get going on some of the conservation projects which WWF had in mind. She thought that gradually they were making some headway with the big international financial institutions, but a little push from Canada would help too, showing that Canadians felt that way.

B. des Clers (International Foundation for the Conservation of Game, France) said that Mrs. Bata had talked about the help that industry could give to conservation. She had mentioned that the wildlife conservation projects and environmental projects could be economically profitable. He wondered if she, as a business leader, would find it possible, among her friends and relations in the business world and the banking world, to set up something which would be a little bit in parallel with the multilateral agencies that existed today, which would be an international banking help. She had mentioned Zimbabwe, in particular, with this problem of the peasants not being able to buy salt, and therefore losing the value of the elephant skin, which was about as valuable as the elephant's ivory. She had also mentioned Zambia, where there was this integrated rural development project in the Luangwa Valley, which was an economically viable project needing $1 million in investment, and was supposed to bring in about $10 million turnover within the first 3 years. This was now in the hands of bilateral aid and multilateral aid, and he wondered if it would not be possible to have a private sector aid in these projects.

S. Bata replied that, about four weeks ago, she had had a long meeting with the Chairman of the International Chamber of Commerce. They were discussing whether maybe the Chamber should introduce some kind of a sub-committee that looked at environmental questions, and that would somehow stimulate industry to think a little bit in the longer term. For industry it was very important to have prosperity all over the world, and to have stability, and as long as there were these environmental problems, they would not be able to achieve it. She hoped that they could somehow motivate some of these business institutions to help them with their work. She also had had discussion with some of the people at OECD, simply because her husband was involved in it, and thought that there too they might make some headway. The African disaster really had shaken a lot of people. They now realized what could happen to an economy if something went wrong with the environment. She thought Mr. des Clers' remarks were very valid.

H.A. Clarke (Canadian Wildlife Service) thanked Mrs. Bata for coming to Ottawa to share her thoughts with them. Her speech had been very appropriate in terms of the theme of the conference, "Canada's role in world wildlife conservation". Certainly, as a Canadian, as a friend of the environment and of wildlife, she was contributing in an immense way to the challenges of the world, and particularly in Africa. She was certainly doing her share, and had given them some very good points as to how they might be able to help.

Panel on CITES (1)

INTRODUCTION OF PANEL MEMBERS

B. des Clers
Director, International Foundation for the Conservation of Game
Chairman of Panel

(James Bourque, Deputy Minister, Renewable Resources, Northwest Territories, as Session Chairman, introduced the panel topic, CITES, and Mr. des Clers.)

The Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference is celebrating its 50th anniversary, and has chosen as its general theme on this occasion, "Canada's role in world wildlife conservation". Our panel's objective is to place CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species) within the framework of this role played by Canada, and this will be illuminated for you by:

- a fellow-Canadian of yours, who is the Secretary General of this international treaty, Eugene Lapointe;

- from south of the border, a lawyer and past chief of the US delegation to CITES, who has great practical and international experience in the functioning of the Convention, Richard Parsons;

- and also some eminent Canadians who will present somewhat complementary national perspectives, as perceived by NGOs, natives and non-consumptive users, who are respectively:

  Ken Brynaert, Executive Vice-President of the Canadian Wildlife Federation,

  the Hon. Red Pedersen, Minister, Renewable Resources, Northwest Territories, and

  Kent MacKay, representing the International Wildlife Coalition.

My own presence here, which is a great honour to me, is perhaps due to my many friends in Canada, both in and out of government, but perhaps also as a member of the very select and somewhat secret Council of International Environmental Law. Or it may be simply because of my long-time association with CITES, since I was responsible, nearly 8 years ago, for the drafting of the resolution approved by the Parties at their 2nd Conference, specifying that personal hunting tropies, even of Annex I species, were to be considered as non-commercial, and therefore could be brought home by sportsmen--but more about this point later.

Panel on CITES (2)

THE CITES PERSPECTIVE

A summary
E. Lapointe
Secretary General
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)

With the text of the CITES Convention providing that: "Recognizing, in addition, that international co-operation is essential for the protection of certain species of wild fauna and flora against over-exploitation through international trade;", this leads to the present situation in which we have two paradoxes:

(1) International co-operation

The philosophy of any government in the world joining an international agreement is to ask itself, "What can I gain out of it?", whilst in CITES the question the government must ask itself is, "What can I put in it?". It took a long time for CITES, as an international forum, to realize this, but now this reality has become more widely accepted. International co-operation is different in CITES from what it is in any other international agreement.

(2) Conservation versus trade

Whilst the aim of CITES is to avoid international trade becoming the cause of extinction of certain wildlife species, it has become apparent lately that the only way certain species could be conserved was by allowing trade in them. This is another realization of CITES as the major international instrument capable of finding a proper balance between economic interests and conservation requirements.

CITES has been through its growing-up stage and is now fully mature to really achieve its purposes. The next meeting of the Conference of the Parties, to be held in Ottawa from 12 to 24 July 1987, should provide an opportunity to show to the world what can be done through a rational approach to complex problems.

Panel on CITES (3)

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL PERSPECTIVES

R.M. Parsons
Washington Counsel
Safari Club International

The unfortunate part of my part of the discussion is that it is hard to know what to say. What do you say about the international legal perspectives, and who cares? If you follow CITES, you will notice that no one acts like they care about the international legal perspectives, yet it is an international legal document. Well, what is that? If you go to law school, and if you study international law, the first question that you deal with is --is it law? What is international law? Does it really deserve that name? You then end up spending an entire term debating this concept and reading cases and discussing it, and no one every really comes to a conclusion. So being asked to talk about the international legal perspectives of CITES is virtually an impossible task.

I have listened carefully to what earlier speakers have said and, as we talk about CITES, I would like you to keep in mind a couple of remarks that have come out. One speaker said that Ramsar, the treaty on wetlands, is a very important international treaty on conservation, perhaps the most important. I can agree with that from one perspective; Ramsar goes to the heart of the problem for wildlife: habitat, habitat loss, habitat protection. CITES does not; it affects trade. On the other hand, Ramsar has 41 Parties while CITES has almost 100 Parties. When you look at the map and put pins in all the CITES countries, most of the world belongs to CITES--and it keeps growing. Why? What significance is there in the fact that there are 100 Parties to CITES? It was also said that Ramsar should have more teeth. I want you to think about that.

Another point was that Canada is unlikely to sign the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species because of the well-known views on marine resources held by certain parties; keep that in mind. It was also said that the "World conservation strategy" is a new departure because it is not a rear-guard action on the conservation of species; it emphasizes instead human values and the role of wildlife in supporting wildlife--a very interesting and important concept to be kept in mind with regard to CITES. We were also told that in Zimbabwe there are experiments where the local villagers are given a role in the protection of the wildlife in national parks. They are allowed to utilize the products of culled animals and, in return, they help to keep poachers out of the parks. We were told, too, about what I consider to be a rather miraculous reforestation of Portland Cement lands in Mombasa, which includes game ranching. Game ranching is commerce. Game ranching occurs because you have a product to sell. That is what game ranching is all about. Keep that in mind too.

Reaching a compromise

Now, back to international law. Is international law really law, and what does that have to do with CITES? Well, the answer is no, not as you understand law. That is a very important distinction. Punishment, or sanctions, are a specific element of law as you and I understand it. We understand law to be something passed by the Congress or the Parliament or a more local body that is empowered by its citizens to pass laws and, if you break those laws, there are punishments or sanctions.

In the original negotiation of CITES, the conference went on for 3 weeks and a large part of that was taken up with the concept of "teeth". The original drafts of CITES had teeth in the form of mandatory trade bans. These bans applied if countries violated the principles of CITES. Those teeth were rejected. They were rejected in favour of compromise as the primary element of CITES.

The reliance on compromise, rather than punishment, is a hallmark of international law. It is what makes international law work. However, my feeling is that CITES has been the captive of certain politically motivated elements of a number of societies that favour the use of punishment and sanctions in forcing actions. This is antithetical to compromise and has been a serious problem with CITES.

I see Canada as one of the few real leaders in CITES for the rational approach to wildlife management and utilization--the approach that uses compromise rather than punishment. I see the United States as having given up a large part of that role, and a large part of the leadership in CITES. I think that the fact that the CITES Conference will be held here in 1987 is a key event and a key opportunity for Canada to take leadership in a rational, sensible approach towards the conservation of wildlife as it is effected through CITES.

Now back to the legal aspects of CITES. As a treaty, CITES has to have that element that Mr. Lapointe referred to: what do we get out of it? In other words, a treaty is a political compromise, both in its original language and in its daily workings. That makes it different from the law you are used to. There is certainly a political process that everybody, every country, every jurisdiction goes through when it passes a law. There are lots of reasons why laws are passed. In international law, you approach it not from the point of view of a body that has power and can make sanctions, you approach it from the point of view of a negotiation. Parties that negotiate have something they need or want, or they are responding to some request from somebody who needs or wants something, and so they reach an agreement. Agreement means commonality; agreement requires compromise.

The Swiss delegate put it this way at a meeting in 1981: the best that CITES can achieve, on any given topic, is the minimum that every country is able to deliver. They can come to a meeting and they can talk and talk about what ought to be done and what should be done, but the question is, what can they deliver? What are they actually willing to do? It is the lowest common denominator of what all countries are willing to do that will be effective--not the desires of some, or the ability of some--but the lowest common denominator.

Enforcement aspect

In that regard, let us talk about enforcement. Enforcement is another aspect of law as we normally know it. Let me say as a side note that enforcement is very important to the users' community that I represent professionally, because unless the world at large accepts the fact that there is reasonable enforcement in the utilization of threatened species, there will be no trade in those species. CITES has served as a great benefit for the users' community, by giving it the respectability to be able to say, yes, we trade in CITES species, but they are protected. That is beginning to be accepted.

Our Chairman, Mr. des Clers, hosted a conference in Manaus, Brazil recently on the status of the jaguar. A statement was made by the chairman of the cat species group from IUCN that it is fairly well accepted today that the commercial trade in spotted cats is no longer a serious threat to spotted cats around the world. Now, you can pick at that statement, but by and large that is an accepted perception. CITES has effectively cut out a lot of the illegal trade and it continues to improve in that role.

However, every time a statement like that is made about enforcement, somebody says, "yes, but there is this" and "yes, but there is that". They fail to recognize that here, too, we are dealing with a kind of lowest common denominator. That commonality includes dealing with enforcement actions in countries where having electricity 7 days a week can be a minor miracle, and where coping with starvation has a higher priority. There is a great failure to recognize the realities of the world in dealing with wildlife conservation.

To return now to the political nature of this treaty, there are two kinds of things that countries get out of belonging to CITES, and the reasons that they do, in my view. One is that the consumer nations, the so-called market countries, are normally reacting to a political constituency. There are two kinds of political constituencies in most of these countries. There is what I would call the traditional sports/conservationist constituency, which understands at a very deep level the need to conserve wildlife in its habitats. There is also the more recently developed highly political and vocal constituency, which has something other than a management view of wildlife and tends to be more protection-orientated in its attitude towards wildlife. This group, in its best moments, wants to conserve wildlife just because it is there, just because we share a planet with quite a few species, many of which are truly awesome if you come to appreciate them. That is one side, the market countries.

Then you have the producer countries, and they have different things that they want out of CITES, out of this legal document. Some of them, and this is typified by Latin American countries, have been exploiting their species at a rather heavy level for many, many years. They view the developed countries in North America and Europe as a great vacuum cleaner which sucks their animals out of their jungles, and they have an unfortunate tendency, I think, to blame a lot of things on these developed countries. What they want, though, is some assistance in stopping this process, because they realize that it is almost impossible to control exports, whereas controlling imports is more feasible. It is not perfect but it is more feasible.

There is another kind of producer country, and this is typified by Africa and, in my view, by Canada, and these are countries that recognize that they have wildlife that is valuable, that always has been valuable, that always has been in demand, and that represents an opportunity for their people. They are interested in utilizing CITES to legitimize trade and to get control over trade, because CITES offers something never offered before, and that is why it is a valuable legal instrument. It invites countries on both sides of the transaction to co-operate in regulating trade. That is something that they did not have before.

Now, there are a lot of people who do question the usefulness of CITES. My own feeling is that if there is balance in CITES, if there is recognition of the various needs and the various reasons why countries belong and observe this legal document, then CITES will be successful. I think that it is a good document; it has lots of flexibility and lots of room for different solutions to different problems. As long as CITES remains the political captive of one side or another, then CITES is in trouble. I think this is the perception that came out of the Buenos Aires Conference.

I believe many countries rightfully ask the question, is CITES really worth it? Is the compromise that led to this legal instrument in the first place still there? I

I do not know; I think it is, but I think that is still a big question and I think Canada has the opportunity, next year, to take a leading role in bringing that compromise and that rational view of wildlife utilization into CITES. It is very much needed, so I am looking forward to seeing Canada exercise some real leadership on some of the very tough issues that are going to come up at that conference.

Panel on CITES (4)

A NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION (NGO) PERSPECTIVE

K.A. Brynaert
Executive Vice-president
Canadian Wildlife Federation

Being asked to express the NGO view is a situation or a role, I suppose, that I have been cast in many times. I find that at the conclusion of my remarks, usually some NGOs come to me and say, "You sure didn't express my view". I suppose that is the difficulty of asking one individual to take on that kind of a task.

However, today I am in a little more fortunate position. As a result of the group that came together at Buenos Aires, we call it the "Ad Hoc Working Group to CITES", we did put together a group of NGOs that have convened three meetings since the Buenos Aires meeting. We have prepared a position paper which has been submitted to CITES that I think expresses very well the concerns of NGOs, and the matters that we think might lead to changes that would strengthen CITES and get it to do a better job. So I am fortunate that I can use this paper to give you truly an NGO position on how they see CITES.

Procedural problems

To begin with, we value the right of non-governmental organizations to participate in the meetings of the Conference of the Parties. However, we feel that certain NGOs have abused this right to the point of twisting the deliberations of the Parties in an emotional and biased fashion. The business of the conservation, management and proper regulation of wildlife and plants is difficult at best. Reliable scientific and commercial data on which to base rational judgements are hard to come by. Even the most developed nations do not have precise population or biological information on the species of plants and animals which inhabit their boundaries, except the severely endangered ones like the California Condor in the United States.

To be effective the procedure of a meeting of the Conference of the Parties must encourage thorough and rational deliberation on the best available data and must be open to consider all avenues of conservation. There are two good examples of procedural problems. The first relates to the attendance and the voting of official delegates from the countries that are Parties to the Treaty.

There were many charges that, at the Buenos Aires Conference, some NGOs bought votes by agreeing to pay for the travel and lodging of delegates from Party countries, if they would support their positions. This matter is such a serious threat to the integrity of CITES proceedings that I do not think it really requires any further elaboration.

The second example relates to the way that amendments to the Appendices are considered at meetings of the conference. Years ago, the Parties set up a procedure for the screening of proposals for such amendments, calling for all the interested delegates to meet in committee, during the meeting, and discuss the proposals. This gives proponents the opportunity to present their case at the beginning of the conference, allowing adequate time for a rational consideration of the facts and for compromise when necessary. At Buenos Aires, the committee was limited to consideration of noncontroversial issues. Therefore, by the time the controversial species proposals were considered officially, there was virtually no advance discussion of anything that was controversial. Even where there was some discussion of controversial proposals, the delegates from non-English speaking countries could not participate because of the lack of interpretation facilities.

Since there had been no advance discussion of the controversial issues by the screening committee, the time for debate in plenary sessions had to be severely limited. If memory serves me correctly, I think we dealt with something like 90 species, and the chair allowed that there would be 4 minutes discussion on each species--2 minutes for the proponent and 2 minutes for those opposed. Certainly that is not enough time to have a good discussion on such a serious topic. This led to repetitive statements and the using up of available time. The end result was that the views of certain NGOs who were able to mount a heavy lobbying effort, using biased, emotional and inaccurate material, were able to prevail over the rational consideration of the issues.

One of the areas that did cause concern was with regard to record-keeping, and we, as the NGO group, are encouraging the improvement of the record-keeping at the meetings of the Conference of the Parties. The record of the meeting is the only source that can be used to interpret the decisions of the Parties. This can become quite critical when looking at enforcement actions of the Parties, or regulations which they plan to adopt, to implement the Parties' decisions. The records of the meeting are made from notes kept by rapporteurs, who attend each committee or plenary session. These notes are taken by hand, in one language, worked into session reports, translated and copied, often overnight, for review by the Parties. Normally, the session records are distributed in the participants' boxes on the morning after the particular session. They are often the first order of business as the days' sessions convene, and the chairman asks if there are any changes; if not, the record is accepted as is. I think it is obvious that perhaps that is not the best way to manage the record.

Need for information

The Convention says that observers shall have the right to participate--observers being the non-governmental organizations. In order for that provision to have any meaning, NGOs must have full information on what is occurring. This should surely include all information about the preparatory meetings of the Technical Committee, the Central Committee, and any other groups related or operating with regard to the meeting of the Conference of the Parties. NGOs must have this information in sufficient time to be able to review it, study the matter and prepare input or a response. After all, the whole idea of the Article 11 provision is that, because of the working interest of NGOs, they are knowledgeable and have useful things to offer in the deliberations of the Conference of the Parties.

As an example of the gap in the information, the last few reports of the plenary sessions in Buenos Aires were sent to governments but not to NGOs, and those sessions contained some very important debate and discussion on several species. Such notification reports contain much information about the implementation of decisions taken by the Parties at the meetings of the conference, and also contain information relevant to the deliberations of the next meeting of the conference.

We recommend that the Secretariat send the notifications to any NGO that requests such a service. We propose that a price be set for this subscription that would allow the Secretariat to recover its costs. We recommend that the Secretary and the

Standing Committee undertake consideration of constructive changes to the procedures and structure of the meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

CITES is, without question, the most important conservation law in the world. Yet, there are sharply differing views as to how such conservation is best carried out. We believe that the needs of human beings are proper and necessary elements in the conservation formula. We also believe that utilization of wildlife and plants often gives sufficient values to those species to act as a practical incentive for their conservation.

We are fully aware that there are others who believe that the existence of markets for various species will doom them, because people cannot control their desires and will therefore overutilize the wildlife and the plants. CITES offers the opportunity for compromise between these and other views through its mechanism of regulation based on rational assessments of the best available commercial and scientific data. Any steps that we can take to ensure that consideration of such data and the deliberations of the appropriate regulatory regime are complete, unemotional and rational will benefit all species, including mankind.

Panel on CITES (5)

A NATIVE PERSPECTIVE

The Hon. R. Pedersen
Minister of Renewable Resources
Northwest Territories

I am sure that some of you are wondering why a red-haired Dane is standing up here speaking to you on the native perspective. That is, of course, our democratic principle. I was elected in a constituency that is about 85% Inuit people. They chose me in free elections to represent them in a legislature which is predominantly of native people--Dene and Inuit and Inuvialuit--who then in turn, in the normal democratic voting process, chose that I should represent the Assembly in this portfolio. That is why I am here.

I want to stress that the Northwest Territories, and native people as a whole throughout Canada, are getting very concerned about CITES. The gentlemen here at the head table, all of them, are people whom I met in Buenos Aires at the last CITES meeting, and some of the points that have been raised disturbed us greatly. One in particular was the allegation of apparent vote-buying by NGOs through the funding of delegations from nations to come to the meeting. I forget the exact number, but it was 23 or 26 nations arrived funded by NGO organizations. We were told this at the last convention and that is very disturbing. We know that the Secretariat is trying to address this and we certainly hope that it will be addressed satisfactorily before the 1987 meeting.

We are also concerned that CITES, which began and is intended to be a trade convention, an organization to regulate trade in endangered species, is becoming, through political influence on the floor of the convention, a wildlife management convention. There are very obvious attempts to establish wildlife management programs under international control in other Parties' countries. Sometimes this appears to be motivated to satisfy a particular internal political need in one country by transferring it to another.

The CITES Convention appears to have a growing protectionist stance, and there have even been attempts to introduce motions which, in fact, would eliminate all use of not only wildlife but of animals, period.

Something left

Native people in the North are very familiar with the concepts of conservation. They have, in fact, been practicing them for centuries, for generations. The reason that we today have wildlife that we can even concern ourselves about, and the reason that most of us in this room, in fact, have jobs connected with that, is because native people throughout the world, particularly in the jurisdiction I am in, have over these many generations conserved the wildlife so that indeed there is something left for us to care about and to concern ourselves about. It is, therefore, particularly disturbing to the people that I represent that the countries that are trying to limit our wise use and sustainable use of wildlife, in many cases, appear to be those who destroyed their own wildlife resources some time ago. That includes the country that I came from originally.

In the North, and generally throughout Canada, for some years now the renewable resource economy has been somewhat down-played as being a domestic or a subsistence economy. Far greater emphasis was placed on the development of what was often termed a real economy, based on non-renewable resources like minerals and hydrocarbon developments. We are, of course, finding now, as we had been concerned about for years, that this so-called real economy is collapsing around us through the dictation of world prices on the commodities. It is causing a tremendous hardship in our part of the world. In the meantime, the one thing that remains constant is our renewable resource economy.

A recent study conducted by my Department of Renewable Resources places the replacement food value of renewable resources harvested in the Northwest Territories at a minimum of $70 million. This is an easy figure to throw out, but I want you to relate that to our very small population of only 50 000 people to realize the importance of it. That is $1400 per person, for an average of between $5000 and $6000 per family within our jurisdiction, of real income from food from renewable resources. That represents just over one-third of the real income, the family income, in the Northwest Territories. So it is a very significant part of our total economy. The value and the level of this harvest are sustainable; they can be counted on year after year. We are a very large jurisdiction, over one-third of the land mass of Canada, more than 10 times the size of a country like Sweden, for instance. We have the largest free-roaming animal herds in the world. Our largest caribou herd, for instance, the Bathurst herd, numbers some 400 000 animals; it is a very sustainable harvest we take. So, to us, it is very definitely an economic activity.

Political overtones

I was pleased to hear Mr. Lapointe mention that unless you give economic value to wildlife species, you do not get much support for this beautiful principle of conservation, and this is very true. Mr. Lapointe also mentioned that there should be no political overtones in CITES. On the floor of CITES I would tend to agree with this, but I still have to disagree with the general principle. I think we have to realize that, whether we want it or not, it is political. We cannot hide behind idealism and say that it is not, when it really is. It becomes political because we expend public funds on CITES and the things that CITES stands for.

At the last meeting, a species which we had been promoting, the Gyrfalcon, was upgraded to Appendix I. It becomes almost impossible for me, as a politician, to justify to my electors and to my Legislature our expending money on continued research on a species from which we have no possibility of any economic benefit. It is, therefore, very much a political issue. It also becomes very difficult, and may some day become impossible, for me as a politician to go to my colleagues in the Cabinet and the rest of our Legislature and justify expending money on bringing six people from our department to a conference such as this, if there does not seem to be any return to our jurisdiction. So, whether we like it or not, I submit to you it is very much a political issue. We had better realize that if we are to get anywhere.

We have to conserve, there is no question about that, but conservation means harvesting. Without harvesting we are not practicing conservation at all. It has to be done within sustainable limits. We should not, through CITES or any other international bodies, be imposing unnecessary economic hardships on people who have not deserved this. The enforcement angle, the punishment angle, was mentioned. We find it very difficult to accept that our population in the North should be forced to live at the poverty level in a welfare state because of imposed notions on how we should manage wildlife in our area. We are accused of this from areas of the world that have failed to manage their own.

Examples of that are the seal-skin boycotts organized by NGO organizations, the unilateral United States ban on importation of marine mammal products, and the European Economic Community's banning of imports of all marine mammal products. Despite the incontrovertible evidence that northern seal populations are, in fact, very healthy and thriving, the trade in these species was eliminated, completely contrary to the original purpose of CITES, which is to control trade because of endangered species. This became an emotional issue. We find it very difficult to accept such things.

Better decisions

The rules and procedures of CITES need revision. I am pleased to hear that they are getting this revision. They need it in order to return the Convention to its original purpose, which is to regulate the international trade.

The Conference of the Parties needs to have better technical advice. This has to be presented in a more timely fashion in order to enable us to reach better decisions. Member states need to have more time to consider the evidence, so that they can ask the important questions, and range states need more time to gather the relevant evidence in order to answer legitimate questions in stating or defending their cases. We will be making all these points during the preparation for the next Conference of the Parties of CITES in Ottawa next year. I want you to know that we will be going there and we will be doing these things with very strong support, and with the assistance of the native organizations that represent many of our northern residents.

This effort is not merely on behalf of the Government of the Northwest Territories. We do feel that the key to successful wildlife management in the North, and indeed anywhere else, and the key to many other issues around the world, is what was stressed by earlier speakers--co-operation. Co-operation means involving all of the interested parties in coming to a consensus, coming to a solution that we hope is acceptable to all. It certainly does not mean confrontation, dealing by ultimatum, and putting it that it has to be my way or no way.

We believe that we are doing a good job in co-operating with the people of the North to manage the wildlife in our homeland. We are not so sure that the preservationist movement that is preventing our legitimate utilization of our resources can claim to have quite the same record of co-operation, rather than confrontation.

Panel on CITES (6)

A NON-CONSUMPTIVE USER'S PERSPECTIVE

B.K. MacKay
International Wildlife Coalition

The program identifies me as representing the non-consumptive users' perspective of Canada's role in world wildlife conservation, particularly as it pertains to CITES, and I am not even sure what that means. We all consume to a greater or lesser degree, even if we do so in the so-called non-consumptive way. I ask that it be taken as given that consumption of resources is inevitable and essential to survival, including human survival.

Jim Bourque said earlier that decisions should be made on the best technical advice available. I concur wholeheartedly, and that has been reiterated by several people in various ways. I want you people to keep that one in mind. We will get back to it in a very short time.

It has also been said that Canadians must resist protectionism or that we must practice compromise. I submit that telling Canadians to resist protectionism, or to endorse compromise, is sort of like telling pigeons to excrete on statues in the park--it is not necessary--they will do it.

Controlling consumption

Both interspecific and intraspecific competition are the universal results of the process of natural selection. Our own species, through the application of technology, removes itself from the predator's natural dependency upon its prey for the caloric intake necessary to fuel the act of predation itself. In naturally evolved, non-technological, predator-prey relationships, the population status of the predator is dependent upon the population status of the prey, and extinction caused by predator overwhelming prey is so rare that I know of no instance of it having happened, except where the predator's population has been expanded into a new area by the use of human technology.

To compensate for the consumptive excesses possible through the use of technology either in direct predation, such as hunting, or through indirect wildlife population depletion, such as habitat destruction, we must impose upon ourselves rules, laws, regulations, treaties, traditions and quotas to control our exploitive use of wildlife to what we hope is the degree necessary to preserve from extinction species that would otherwise be lost, and more pragmatically, to preserve resources upon which there is economic dependency.

CITES is one such means of controlling our consumption of wildlife, specifically wildlife that would or might otherwise become endangered or exterminated through commercial exploitation for the purpose of international trade. In fact, CITES is the most effective international wildlife conservation treaty there is, even if one regards it strictly as a trade treaty.

Governments and NGOs at CITES represent a spectrum of philosophical attitudes towards and interest in wildlife. With no time available to deeply explore philosophical considerations, I hope I may be forgiven if I oversimplify the extreme ends of the spectrum by classifying them, for the sake of discussion, as protectionism at one end and exploitation at the other, with the understanding that neither term is meant to be taken literally, and in the hope that the terms will be considered free from emotive and prejudicial connotations.

Within this somewhat arbitrary "scale" of concern and interest, NGOs tend more towards what might fairly be called extreme positions than do governments, and neither NGOs nor governments are necessarily consistent at all times in their approach to various issues that arise at CITES.

Canada's image

While I like to think that I am an objective observer at CITES, of course I am also an active participant for an NGO towards the protectionist end of the spectrum, and from that position, in consultation with both governmental and non-governmental delegates and observers to CITES, including both those with whom I am in agreement and those with whom I am in opposition, I have discovered that Canada has an extremely negative image within the world conservation community.

At least most, if not all, conservationists that I know regard Canada at CITES as a possibly well-meaning but overly bureaucratic, exploitationist-orientated, overly nationalistic, materialistic and highly political entity. At a CITES Conference I heard one frustrated government official, in an undiplomatic moment, describe Canada as a "petty, mean-spirited, pouting brat among nations". Controversial decisions made at CITES must, by definition, ultimately be value judgements, and it is understood that in any controversy between providing or continuing CITES protection and removing or withholding such protection, Canada, and there may be a few exceptions to this, but Canada in general will never side with the protectionist position unless there is political expediency in doing so.

In every question between supporting those seeking protection and those seeking exploitation at CITES, you can work on the assumption that Canada will support the exploitationist side unless, as I say, there is political expediency dictating otherwise. The scientific merits of the issue seem to be of the least concern to Canada. Many other countries do the same sort of thing, and that should be clearly understood, perhaps all of them do at some time, but very few do so as often and as blatantly as does Canada.

It must also be said that the Canadian delegation at CITES, as a large and conspicuous group, seems to me to exude a sense of superiority, as if, given the perceived relative lack of endangered species in Canada, we therefore have the most realistic and successful approach to wildlife management.

The fact is that Canada's wildlife is profoundly different from that of most CITES countries in that it exists in a huge country that is wealthy, relatively thinly populated, and recently glaciated, and thus covered with vast areas of relatively homogeneous habitat. We simply do not have the rich diversity of speciation many countries have. In Cuba, for example, there are over 20 species of birds endemic to that one, tiny country. In Canada, there is not a single endemic species of bird. Indeed, there is only a small handful of endemic breeding species and of those, one is extinct, one is critically endangered and survives only through the kind of massive and expensive protection campaigns few countries could afford to mount, one is so critically endangered that its nest is unknown in this century and decades have passed between sightings, and two, the Ross' Goose and the Harris' Sparrow, are apparently holding their own.

There are no endemic reptiles in Canada. There are no endemic amphibians in Canada, and there are almost no endemic mammals, fish or plants. You could destroy an area the size of Cuba, or Denmark for that matter, on Canadian soil and not exterminate a single species. Indeed, you could turn certain areas of Canada, the size of any of the majority of the countries signatory to CITES, into a paved parking lot and not actually exterminate a single species of bird, mammal, reptile or amphibian and few, if any, fish or plants.

The extreme vastness of such Canadian ecosystems as tundra, boreal forest, fields, mountains, lakes and coastlines, all inhabited by a relatively small number of mostly abundant species, has caused Canadians to develop an exploitationist attitude towards wildlife that has led to wildlife management strategies that are fine here but would be inapplicable and dangerous in many so-called Third World or developing countries. We can, to a point too often reached, get away with dangerous procedures because of the inherent resilience of Canadian flora and fauna.

Attitudes at CITES

Mind you, however difficult it is to destroy a species in Canada, compared to other countries, we do manage to do so from time to time. The point is that a superior attitude at CITES is entirely unjustified, and yet Canada presents itself at CITES as a country firmly in effective control of its own resources and opposed to any international influence on how those resources are exploited.

Of about three dozen Canadian citizens at the last CITES Conference of the Parties, in Buenos Aires, who were official delegates or who were accredited by Ottawa, there was one who was struggling hard to remain neutral--he was from the Sierra Club. I was the only one in active opposition to Canada's position on proposals to list Canadian species on the Appendices. Pro-exploitationists, if you want to call them that--I am uncomfortable with these titles but they have been bandied about, so we may as well go with them--pro-exploitationist NGOs enjoyed Canadian government support, not necessarily federal--it could be provincial/territorial or whatever--allowing some of the strongest lobbying efforts at CITES to be mounted against protectionist positions. As was the case 2 years earlier in Botswana, I heard reports from voting delegates of Canadian so-called diplomatic pressure being asserted--this was before the meeting--in all instances against, never for, protectionist proposals or positions on contentious issues.

To illustrate what a conservationist is up against at CITES, I will relate some anecdotes witnessed by me. In a restaurant in Buenos Aires, some friends and I happened to choose seats that were very close to where Thai delegates were seated. The Thai delegates were being intently lobbied by official Canadian delegates to oppose a West German proposal to list the narwhal on Appendix I of CITES.

You may believe this or not, but some of us actually made a polite effort not to overhear the conversation. Nevertheless, we could not help but hear the Canadians make what might be called a veiled offer of federal assistance in developing fish farms in Thailand, as the Thais, themselves, later confirmed. They said that was the carrot that was on the end of the stick. That sort of thing is neither illegal nor unique to

Canada but it is marginally sleazy, under the circumstances, and it is not the sort of thing that enhances Canada's reputation at CITES.

On another occasion, I asked a Canadian scientific adviser if Canada would support the concern conservationists had about the Chilean false larch. Chile was seeking to create a loophole through which it could continue exploiting the wood of this magnificent and very endangered tree. The issue was complex, but if understood it became clear that the Chilean proposal would endanger the species' chances of survival. I had documentation on the subject I was anxious to share with voting delegates--that is what they call lobbying.

The scientific adviser blurted out a response to my question, in front of a witness, to the effect that Canada would most likely oppose the Chilean proposal, which is what we wanted, unless Chile indicated that it would vote with Canada against proposals to upgrade CITES protection of Canadian species.

Happily the very next Canadian scientific adviser I encountered, just a few moments later, cheerfully endorsed the conservationists' position with no political strings attached. It is a small thing, but it is the sort of thing I witnessed. I heard many allegations, but I am talking about things I know about personally. I would have hoped all scientific advisers for Canada would have put science ahead of these political considerations. There is enough politics. People say politics cannot be avoided; then do not criticize the NGOs who happen to have a different view than your own for being political if that is the case. But the most political entity there was Canada. I could not begin to offer what Canada can offer to people. By the way, Chile eventually withdrew its proposal.

Some reactions

As was the case in Botswana two years prior to that one, Canadian native people sought, in Buenos Aires, to lobby the African countries in a block. Here a political trade-off was possible. Some African countries wanted exemptions, and incidentally I do not necessarily disagree with what they wanted or with any aspect of it, but they wanted exemptions or increases on quotas for the numbers of leopard skins they could export (leopards being listed on Appendix I), even though they failed to provide the scientific data supposedly required by CITES to justify such moves. A number of African countries wanted markets for elephant ivory and crocodile skins as well.

Some African delegates later told me they were appalled by the lobbying, but others lapped it up. Many African countries and Canada did, indeed, support each other to share votes--that is politics. There was, I am very pleased to report, something of a backlash to the intensity of the Canadian lobbying techniques and the overwhelmingly exploitationist image Canada projected to the world, but never was the backlash more pronounced than on 30 April 1985, as the CITES meeting in Buenos Aires was coming to a close.

Canada had just led a successful attack against (naturally) an Israeli proposal for CITES to endorse in principle the concept of a convention, modeled after CITES, to set international guidelines and international standards for the treatment of wild animals that enter into international trade. That session was supposed to have been chaired by a member of the delegation from India but, rightly or wrongly, or perhaps, and I think this is really the case, as a result of simple misunderstanding, a member of the Canadian delegation had, to the disconcertion of the Indians, been put in the chair. He then recognized Canada's wish to read a statement into the record.

The statement was read by Nellie Cournoyea, who began by identifying herself as the Minister of Renewable Resources for the Northwest Territories. Of annoyance to many people was her statement that "The people of the Northwest Territories are unique in Canada and in the world. Our survival as a distinct people is at stake because we are totally dependent upon continued access to our wildlife as our main source of food. We ... were managing and conserving wildlife long before the Europeans came to North America."

There are, of course, peoples in parts of South American, Africa, Asia and the Pacific regions who are at least as dependent upon access to their native wildlife as are the Inuit, but without access to the sort of benefits that Canada can provide. Even in Botswana, even in their own country, the Kalahari Bushmen did not have government sponsored NGOs at CITES, but then, why should they? There is nothing that any CITES proposal would or ever could do that would limit the access of Canadian people, native or otherwise, to Canadian wildlife. Such access is entirely a matter of internal regulations and has nothing to do with CITES.

Extinction issue

The Minister then went on to say, "Europe's interference in North American game management has resulted in the extinction and exploitation of major game and bird populations. This interference will no longer be tolerated by Canada nor by the Canadian native peoples."

Her statement was certainly belligerent, but I question that it made any sense. If the Minister was suggesting that a CITES decision to put Canadian Gyrfalcons or narwhal on Appendix I of CITES and hooded seals and Sandhill Cranes on Appendix II, because those are the Canadian species that were at issue, might lead to the extinction of those or any other species, she was being absurd. If she thought, as her statement said, that the extinction of Canadian species had been caused by wildlife management, then she was at odds with the rest of the Canadian delegation, whose faith in wildlife management as a viable conservation methodology bordered on the fanatical. Certainly it was total lack of any management or control or quotas that led to the extinction of the Labrador Duck, the Great Auk, the sea mink, the Passenger Pigeon and the eastern elk.

The confusion and antagonism the Minister seemed to be intent on causing reached a new pitch when she said, "We resent the current practice of some nations, influenced by non-governmental organizations who submit proposals resulting in nation states polarizing around issues, which result in management approaches that are to the detriment of effective management and utilization of the species, which should be our prime concern. The role of non-governmental organizations in fermenting this adversarial situation is well known to CITES delegates."

The Canadian spokesperson seemed oblivious as to how extremely hypocritical her statement sounded to those who had been lobbied for a fortnight against protectionist proposals--lobbied by Canadian NGOs. Whether or not they received government funding, at least some of such organizations as the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, the Assembly of First Nations, the Canadian Sealers' Association, the Fur Council of Canada, the Fur Institute of Canada and the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada are or were perceived as non-governmental organizations, and there could be no reasonable doubt that some of those NGOs directly influenced Canadian policy and, with Canadian government resources at their disposal, sought to influence the decisions of voting delegates from other countries. The Minister, to Canada's shame, was clearly saying that people with whom she disagreed should not be listened to.

Obviously one politician who did not realize or perhaps care what CITES is all about does not represent the Canadian delegation as a whole, although she did at the time she spoke. Cournoyea's antipathy towards those whose opinions countered her own was not universally shared by Canadian delegates and NGOs. I believe I can count as friends members of CITES Canada. I can recall many areas of mutual agreement with CITES Canada. Some of the Canadian NGOs with views opposing my own treated me with courtesy. I had some pleasurable conversations with scientific advisers with whom it was possible to discuss differences while respecting each other's right to differ. CITES is a complex, huge, awkward, underfunded, and at times seemingly unworkable, entity that is nevertheless the best international treaty for the purposes of conservation in effect, and Canada is part of why it works, to the degree that it does work.

Nevertheless it must be said that Canada's image to the international conservation movement is negative. As astounding as some of the things said by Canadians in the heat of the fray might be, they are no less absurd than the statement made in a government report about CITES that identified protectionism as a threat to wildlife. Without underestimating the potential incentive for effective conservation the promise of commercial exploitation of a species may hold for the people called upon to implement such conservation, I challenge anybody to point to a wild species endangered or exterminated because it received too much protection or because its right to exist was advocated.

Without CITES

In closing I would like to say that I am aware that there are people in Canada who would like this country to pull out of CITES. In its history, no country has ever done that, and I can think of little we might do to better show the world how little we care about international conservation than to leave CITES. I do not have a crystal ball, but I can visualize two separate scenarios were Canada to make such a move.

The move would clearly identify Canada as being among those countries, most of them not signatory to CITES, who lack firm commitment to environmental and conservation causes. Once Canada has been even more clearly identified as one of the bad guys, its credibility will be so badly damaged as to facilitate lobbying by those of us seeking CITES (or any other) protection for Canadian species of wildlife. Trade in species for which commercial trade is prohibited by CITES will have to be restricted to the diminishing number of countries not signatory to CITES. There are relatively few such species likely to be involved, and so the influence on world conservation Canada's departure from CITES would have would be almost negligible.

However, there is a second, more alarming, scenario. There is no country that likes to lose a proposal at CITES or to have a species listed against its own wishes. There is, particularly for small, impoverished countries, possible domestic political gain to be had by simply allowing wildlife to be exploited, even to defending the exploitation as long-term risk for short-term gain. When a country joins CITES and abides by CITES decisions, it has shown the world that it believes it has achieved the maturity and self-assurance required to take a greater role in international affairs, and to submit to the majority opinion of a constituency greater than itself, recognizing the need to do so in order to better ensure the survival of wild flora and fauna.

Given the rate of resource depletion extant throughout the world, it would be tragic if Canada, in withdrawing from CITES, were to influence others to do the same to the degree that the already limited effectiveness of CITES was still further compromised. That prospect may not concern those Canadians seeking the withdrawal of Canada from CITES, but I am a conservationist, dedicated to the wisest use and management of the world's dwindling numbers of wild plants and animals, and dedicated to the protection from extinction of all wildlife species. Thus the prospect of weakening CITES, as Canada's departure from CITES possibly could do, bothers me greatly.

We have continually heard about NGO interference with the implication of political lobbying overwhelming objective, scientific deliberation, but I put it to you that the least scientific approach has been the Canadian approach at CITES.

Let me comment on allegations of influence peddling. I represented the Animal Protection Institute at both of the last two meetings of the Parties to CITES, and the Institute responded to grave funding concerns and donated money to bring countries to CITES in Buenos Aires, because it was deemed to be important to have maximum participation of the Parties in order for CITES to be most effective in fulfilling its mandate. Three countries were assisted and I made it a point of honour not to talk to the official representatives of any of them. I never mentioned the Animal Protection Institute's donations and I never lobbied those countries. I had no idea which way they were going to vote and, in fact, I do not know which way they actually did vote on contentious issues of concern to the Animal Protection Institute.

The important thing was to protect CITES and that is what we sought to do. I do not know of any NGO that would oppose the concept of a common fund. Certainly non-conservationist NGOs also contributed to countries being at CITES. I have asked Rick Parsons who was supposed to have peddled their influence, and he does not know; he has heard allegations. I have heard allegations, too, concerning Canada. Canada has a bad image, and for Canada to continue in the development of that negative image is to increase the kind of polarization that does not help anybody, least of all CITES.

I could go on, because there is an awful lot that was said that I would like to respond to, but I think I have said enough to stimulate the discussion, which I believe you hoped would happen, and it would be appropriate if we had some response from you people.

Panel on CITES (7)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ON CITES

B. des Clers (International Foundation for the Conservation of Game) said that his conclusions differed from Mr. MacKay's quite a bit. The Canadian delegation in Buenos Aires did its best to defend itself against attacks. This was perceived by many people, and actually the votes went that way, not just through lobbying but through common sense. Prohibition of trade of a number of species, which were claimed to be endangered in Canada, was tried without scientific evidence. One of the proposals, the only one that managed to get through, was actually passed through lack of time and lack of interest from most of the Parties, and this was the Gyrfalcon proposal. There was absolutely no scientific reason to stop Canada from trading in its populations of Gyrfalcon, an abundant species in Canada from all the scientific data available.

E. Lapointe (CITES Secretariat) said that while he was the servant of the Parties to the Convention, like any faithful servant he had to tell them when something went wrong. Democracy did not play its full role at all times during the meeting. As a result, he had committed the Secretariat to the following. First, they would revise completely the structure of the meeting. Second, they would revise completely the rules of procedure. Third, they would create a special independent fund for those delegates who could not otherwise participate in CITES meetings. Fourth, they would put more emphasis on scientific research and data research to make sure that Parties would have the proper information to make the proper decisions.

The revised structure, he continued, would be implemented in Canada in 1987, where they would have two committees of the whole operating at the same time, consequently giving a chance to all participants to have full discussions on all of the major issues. With respect to procedures, among the changes they suggested were first, getting rid of the secret ballot, and second, trying to design a mechanism which would allow the Conference of the Parties to withdraw the submissions of certain NGOs if they did not behave in the best interests of CITES. With respect to the fund, they were aiming at the funding of about 100 participants for the meeting in Canada in 1987, making sure that each Party had at least two delegates and also total freedom in its policies. With respect to research, they had already undertaken a great deal of activity in studies on sea turtles, leopards, caimans, felines, etc. They were also studying the volume of trade in some 225 species of Appendix II.

R. Orenstein (International Wildlife Coalition) commented that he did not know of a single delegation for which the funding was provided with any strings attached, and would be very interested to hear of some specific examples if any existed. On the question of emotional approaches, NGOs that had had anything to do with any proposals, such as providing advice when requested, had produced proposals which were more thoroughly documented than most of the others. Over the past several conferences, many of the proposals submitted for Appendices, including some that he would love to have seen supported, were presented with practically no data, but with highly emotional arguments.

As far as the claim that people were attempting to stop all trade with CITES, he did not think that any organizations, even those that did not like trade in wildlife, felt that CITES should be used in that way. There were other approaches one could take if that was what one wanted to do. They had also heard a great deal from people who were not happy with the way CITES was going, with reference to how much money the wildlife trade was worth to native peoples of Canada. He did not dispute the value of the trade but he did dispute the idea that CITES had much to do with this. CITES only controlled international trade. The ban on the seal trade in Europe had nothing to do with CITES. As a matter of fact, he had heard that various European delegates had said that if Canada had been prepared to have the seals put on Appendix II of CITES, which would not have stopped trade, the ban might very well not have taken place.

If Canada were to leave CITES, he did not think that there would necessarily be any change in the results of the wildlife trade, but things might be made worse. The only species that was placed in Appendix I at recent meetings that hurt Canada was the Gyrfalcon, but the Gyrfalcon were on Appendix I previously. They were removed in 1981, partly on the assurance of Canadian delegates that no illegal trade would take place--an assurance that was shown to be not correct after the recent sting operations (Operation Falcon) and arrests on the subject. They were only off Appendix I for a 2-year period, during which he did not believe that there was any real trade started. The cost to Canada of staying in CITES was far smaller than that for many Third World countries with many more species on Appendix I, and with many fewer opportunities to produce a viable economy from other sources than Canada had. Those countries nonetheless valued and participated in CITES.

B. des Clers replied that he did not think any members of the panel, when they said they were hoping that Canada would play a leading role within CITES, was thinking that Canada would play a leading role in going out of the door.

R. Parsons (Safari Club International) considered that the anti-trade views of NGOs, as expressed in an article that was published in a newsletter by the Audubon Society in the United States, if carried to extremes, could doom to extinction some of the species for which conservation based on their value was absolutely critical. He also differed with the notion that CITES did nothing but control international trade, implying that it did not have any impacts internally. Mr. Lapointe had said that 40 000 species were on Appendix II. Did they really think that the delegates sat down and actually talked about 40 000 species? No way. What they did was indulge in so-called higher taxa listings. They listed all the felids of the world, except the house cat; they listed all the raptors, all the owls, and so forth. Many, many species were covered in listings of higher taxa, and this had increased the impact of CITES tremendously.

Technically, CITES only regulated international trade, but there had been at least two other approaches that he was familiar with which attempted to expand that somewhat. A couple of years ago Australia proposed the development of management plans for Appendix II species by CITES Parties in panel. The intention was that if the range states did not comply with these management plans, then trade in these species would not be accepted. That had been an attempt to extend the actual working of CITES into management. The other paper, submitted by Costa Rica, proposed that the importing countries of Appendix II species must insist on receiving the data that supported the scientific judgements made when export permits were issued. If the data were not forthcoming, then they must forbid trade in Appendix II specimens. Now this, in his mind, would be a rolling disaster. What some people meant by data even God could not provide to satisfy them. So there had been attempts to take CITES well beyond the role of trade regulation.

His third point was that he had witnessed, and so had many other people there, the use of CITES as a political forum to talk about favourite issues of certain groups--it could be whales or parrots or something else. CITES had unfortunately been captured from time to time for this purpose. So in terms of CITES and its rationality, he thought that the changes that were being made now would take them a great step away from the misuse of CITES as a political forum.

E. Lapointe referred back to the point about the buying of votes. He started by saying that he always referred to the participation of the NGOs as being a major achievement of CITES. However, that advantage could be seriously jeopardized if they had one or two NGOs that went off the track. He had very substantial evidence that it did take place. All it needed was one or two who were a bit vocal or aggressive in their lobbying, and they could have a good chance to ruin the whole show. He also did not believe it appropriate to have direct funding of delegates from any source, even from government sources. This was what they wanted to get rid of at all costs. They had to make sure that whoever came to CITES meetings, and had been funded through the special fund which was in the hands of the Secretariat, would have total freedom in their opinions and in their right to vote.

For this next point, he agreed with Mr. Pedersen that, whether they liked it or not, there would be politics, but the politics he objected to within CITES was that confrontation of power that was being transferred from traditional participation in an international forum to CITES, as if they were negotiating a trade agreement, for example, where they had to show their strength and win the battle. The second aspect of the politics that he did not like, and which had been mentioned by Mr. MacKay, was "I will exchange your tiger for my Gyrfalcon" or "Take off my crocodile and I'll give you your polar bear". That kind of trade-off showed very little respect for the conservation of wildlife species.

M. Hummel (World Wildlife Fund Canada) disagreed with Mr. des Clers' saying that the Gyrfalcon had been shown to be an abundant species in Canada. That was not the case; its status was uncertain, formally classified as being not in any category. He also disagreed with Barry MacKay's claim that CITES in no way affected access to wildlife, particularly by native peoples in northern Canada. Technically that might be true, but having access was not much use to them if a convention such as CITES was inhibiting trade in that species.

The point he wanted to make, with respect to Canada's position in CITES, was that they spent a lot of time talking about how they were going to fend off protectionist proposals, rather than talking about how they could be seizing the initiative and be seen to be a co-operative participant in CITES. There was no doubt that a certain portion of the conservation community internationally felt that Canada had a very bad reputation at CITES. There was also, as had been pointed out, another portion which felt that Canada was kind of taking a last stand and had a very good reputation. He would encourage their delegation next year to consider some conservation initiatives, so that Canada could be seen to not be always resisting and defensive.

B. des Clers said that there had been a strong difference between the Canadian delegation and the US delegation in Buenos Aires. The US delegation had come with files that were all in order. They had had three or four meetings before the Conference and had managed to reach some kind of a consensus on the US position. His impression, and this was not a criticism, was that the Canadian delegation had not had the same sort of chance for preparation. He urged them to make sure that they set up a mechanism between the Canadian Wildlife Service, other federal agencies concerned, the provincial and territorial governments and the interested NGOs to get together and discuss things and make constructive proposals. It was very important that everybody be briefed on subjects before they arrived at the meetings.

E. Lapointe thought that they should not let the small things that had happened, which they tended to exaggerate, make them negative towards CITES. It was an excellent international treaty that offered all kinds of possibilities, but they had to admit that it was still in its growing stage. Instead of being negative towards it, they should start to work towards the maturity level within a few years.

J. Berryman (International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies) said that his association had been strong supporters of CITES since its inception, but had also had grave concerns about its implementation, and shared the concerns that Mr. Brynaert expressed. With respect to the influence of NGOs and the alleged vote-buying, that matter was of sufficient concern on the US side that it was under Congressional review. He hoped that some results from that study would come in time to provide some constructive suggestions for the CITES meeting that would be held in Canada.

A. Frayling (International Fur Trade Federation), having attended the last four of the CITES Conferences for an NGO, commented that under the present structure of the Conference, the really important matters, the real reason why so many people attended at all, were somehow put back to the last day and a half or the last two days of the meeting. Just as they were getting into the teeth of the thing, they were told that each speaker was limited to the two minutes maximum. This had irritated some of the leading speakers who had their facts right and knew what they were talking about. He hoped that this situation would be looked at, in order that the important matters could be debated in the morning and taken the same day, and not be put off to the end of the week. He also expressed surprise that no reference had been made to some possible defects in the chairmanship and conduct of the plenary sessions.

E. Lapointe replied that they needed certain elements to be able to have a proper decision-making process. One of them was a proper structure, proper procedures. The structure had probably been quite valid until the 1981 meeting in Delhi. It had started showing some signs of weakness in the Botswana meeting in 1983, and had proved to be totally inappropriate at the conference in Argentina. What had happened was that the Convention had exploded. In Delhi they had 245 participants, 300 in Botswana, 450 in Argentina, and would have around 650 in Canada in 1987. In Botswana and Argentina, some of the delegates, as well as some of the NGOs, had felt that they were deprived of an opportunity to voice their concerns and make their views known. This had caused some of them to revert to some lobbying tactics that were not necessarily appropriate.

For 1987, it was proposed that the plenary session should be rather limited, with the work done in two basic committees, both having full interpretation. They would be sitting for probably 7 days and, because the Secretariat was going to be funding two participants from each country, the committees would each have one representative of each country. The NGOs would be able to sit in on whatever committee they were interested in. One committee group would take care of technical matters, finance, enforcement, etc., and a scientific committee group would take care of proposed amendments to the Appendices, and proposals for ranching, farming, plants, etc. With this kind of set-up, they hoped that each one of the issues could be discussed fully and, when they reverted at the end of the plenary session, it would be mainly a rubber-stamping exercise.

He agreed that there had been some concern about the chairmanship, not only among the Parties, but in the Secretariat. This issue was now being addressed also through revisions in the rules of procedure, to make sure that they had top people to chair their meetings in the future.

K. Lloyd (NWT Wildlife Management Division) said that the Nile crocodile was listed under Appendix I, and yet under certain conditions trade was allowed and there was a limited quota. He asked Mr. Lapointe how a proposal to increase that quota would be evaluated, and who would do that evaluation.

E. Lapointe replied that the quota had been set by the Conference of the Parties and would be re-evaluated in 1987, again by the Conference of the Parties. At the moment, they were trying to find external funding to get more data on the Nile crocodile.

B. des Clers said that the Conference of the Parties expected the countries which were exporting and trading internationally in wildlife to furnish figures on the numbers of animals that existed in those populations, so that they could take a look at the percentage harvest that was being taken. They were also asking those countries to produce figures and data on trends in those populations. This was fine theoretically, but it was impossible to count every animal. Canada spent a lot of money on wildlife studies and management, and so did the United States, but sometimes the money for this could not be raised in developing countries, and simpler methods of assessing populations and trends would have to be found. Mr. Lapointe had said that for the crocodiles he was looking for outside funding. The reason was that the countries where the crocodiles were found just did not have the institutional support or the finances to carry out these studies themselves.

R. Parsons, responding to some of the critical comments that were made about Canada at past CITES meetings, said he thought that Canada was on the defensive because people who did not know what they were talking about were attacking programs that Canada had been rightfully proud of for many years. Canada also had some unique situations in that it was both a producer and a consumer country. It also had a native population that had a special relationship to wildlife. So Canada had a lot of reasons to react particularly to some of the European proposals. In the preamble to the Convention, it said that the peoples in the countries were the best protectors of their wildlife. There was recognition from the beginning that, although they were an interdependent world and this was a big problem for all, they must go back to basics with the countries that had the wildlife. The view of the people he had talked to was that there was a lot of respect for Canada, and that they found it to be pretty embattled a good deal of the time.

H.A. Clarke (Canadian Wildlife Service) said that he was looking forward to CITES next year. Canada had a lot of good things to say, and he thought that they were going to make every attempt, pulling as many people into the picture as possible, to get into a state of preparedness for next year, so that they could put their best foot forward. He did not advocate propaganda or PR. They had a lot of good factual information which they should use to educate nations who came to the CITES Conference. He believed in partnership and consensus-building. Regardless of what had happened in the past, they were going to go forward in a pretty assertive mood next year in CITES and make a good job of that Convention.

B. des Clers thought that was a very encouraging statement for everybody present. He added that they had found in past CITES Conferences that the participants, who were going to be coming from nearly 100 countries all over the world, were very curious people. They would be curious about what Canada was doing in the field of wildlife management or wildlife trade, or related activities. There were a number of films or other types of information that all participants in CITES would be fascinated to look at. This was something that Canada could be proud of--its policies in wildlife management. This was an opportunity which should not be missed to correct whatever bad impression the CITES people might have of the Canadian delegation. They could have the true facts and the right information.

R. Orenstein pointed out that even though persons, who were members of NGOs, might take positions that were opposed to those that the Canadian government might wish to put forward at CITES, they were not interested in Canada-bashing. Their aim was to support proposals that they felt should be supported for their own intrinsic reasons, and to oppose those that should be opposed for other reasons. This could put them at odds with the official Canadian position, but he did not think that it put them at odds with Canada. He certainly had no objection to Canada defending itself. The question, as Mr. Lapointe had said, was how to go about doing that and what techniques were appropriate.

A matter that had not been addressed in their discussion, he said, was what happened outside the meetings of the Conference of the Parties in two areas. First was the area of enforcement. In many countries there was practically no enforcement; Canada's enforcement was better than some, but not as good as others. There were things that they could teach other Parties and help them with in terms of enforcing the decisions already made: education of customs officers and the on-going preparation of the identification manual, for instance.

The other area was in the preparation of proposals to be considered by the Parties. He did not think that anyone could expect that, even with modified rules and longer periods of debate, really intelligent decisions could be made on the basis of poorly drafted proposals. There was a great need for improvement in assisting countries that wished to put forward proposals by making sure that they had the best data available and that they had experts to draw on, so that the drafting of the proposals would provide the delegates with the kind of information that they needed. This was a way to play down the horse-trading and politics at the Convention, rather than by introducing rules of procedure that might be applied unfairly. Situations occurred, as Mr. Parsons had brought out, where they simply could not get the kind of detailed information they wanted, and then it became a question of who got the benefit of the doubt. He would argue that protection ought to get the benefit of the doubt, on the grounds that if they made a mistake, they might destroy a species and never to able to exploit it again. Others might feel that for various reasons the economics ought to get the benefit of the doubt, and there were undoubtedly cases where that would be forced on them, particularly in Africa and other such places.

E. Lapointe agreed that the two issues Mr. Oreinstein raised were rather important. As the Chairman had mentioned, they were soon having the Technical Committee meeting, where 52 countries would be represented, and about 30 NGOs. Some of the issues that he had mentioned would be discussed. In addition, at the end of September, for 10 days in the United Kingdom, they would have the first enforcement seminar of CITES, which was a follow-up to the implementation seminar for the so-called exporting countries of South America, Africa and Asia. The follow-up to that was an enforcement seminar to which three officials of the Government of Canada would be invited. He suspected that the right type of people to have in there would be someone from the RCMP and someone from Customs, as well as someone from the management authority.

On the question of proposals, they were addressing this at the moment, in a drastic manner, with the trade specialist group of IUCN. This was to ensure that they could provide some kind of service to the Secretariat which, in turn, could be put into the hands of the countries presenting proposals, making sure that they could benefit from all information necessary to make a good proposal to the Conference of the Parties.

B. des Clers said that he thought it was obvious to the people who had been involved directly with CITES that enforcement was getting better and better. The elephant ivory question had shown that on something which was as easy to transport as ivory across African borders, the controls voted on in Buenos Aires had now brought about a drop in the price of illegal, poached ivory to a fraction of the price of legal ivory. Also, shipments had been seized, a little bit, all over the world.

The agenda for the coming Technical Committee, he continued, would include the questions of important trade in Appendix II species and humane transport of live specimens of wildlife, interpretation of Article 14 (which was the problem of more restrictive domestic legislation than the Convention provided for), trade in plants and improving the control of trade in plants, control of species raised on ranches and in captivity, also the look-alike species and those species which were given authorization under quota, the business of the worked ivory trade from the African elephant, and the problem of trade in material from the vicuna. Then there would be consideration of the constitution of the scientific committee, of the people who had not been applying the Convention properly, and of the movement of some specimens being used for commercial exhibits.

E. Lapointe, in his final remarks, said he believed that if everybody agreed to compromise and sacrifice, CITES could be one of the major international instruments for mankind in the future. As well, as a Canadian, he took great pride in saying that the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties would be taking place here in Canada, which had so much to show to the rest of the world, not only in terms of wildlife, not only in terms of beauty, but as well in terms of unity of the people. He added that he was ready to meet with any group or individual and have a thorough discussion about the Conference.

J. Bourque (Renewable Resources, NWT), after thanking Bertrand des Clers for chairing the panel discussion, and also all the participants, said that he thought CITES was a worthwhile organization. He was appalled when he was in Buenos Aires to hear the type of criticism that was channelled towards Canada. They had some of the best management systems in the world, between Canada and North America. The only country that stood in their defence in Buenos Aires had been the USA. There was a tremendous job ahead of Canada to educate the public on what they were doing. Canada, he concluded, had the political will and the scientific knowledge to do the right thing. He hoped that they would take it from there.

Panel on CITES (8)

CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

B. Des Clers

I am personally convinced, and there is every evidence to demonstrate it, that CITES is, at the present time, the most powerful existing international legal instrument for wildlife conservation. But CITES, like any other law, carries with it the inherent weaknesses which are present in every man-made law, good or bad as it may be:

- law can be impossible to enforce,

- law can be misinterpreted, or interpreted in different, sometimes conflicting, ways,

- law can be misused,

- law can be abused.

CITES, which is a good law, is still no different from other laws in this respect: it is not enforced by some countries, some of which are Parties to the Convention; it is interpreted by different countries in different ways; and some people contend that it is sometimes being misused and abused. One thing is certain: CITES is here to stay, and its Secretariat is functioning better and better.

Enforcement

The problem of enforcement is of course difficult, and crops up at all levels:

(1) Some wildlife exporting states have purposely refrained from joining the Convention so that they could carry on with their illegal, but lucrative, trade. The best example is probably that of Burundi: here we have a very small African country which has been for years one of the world's major exporters of ivory--upwards of 30 to 40, and now apparently more than 100 tons per year, the equivalent of the tusks carried by 5000 elephants--and yet, where the only elephant to be found is a single animal kept in the country capital's zoological garden.

The Standing Committee of CITES ordered the Secretariat to use the only method available to deal with such a problem: notify all States Party to the Convention not to accept ivory supposedly originating from Burundi, since it must perforce have been poached in Zaire, Tanzania, Zambia or Uganda, all countries which have heavily poached elephant populations. This measure of retorsion may seem of little effectiveness; however, we must remember that CITES has now been ratified by more than 90 countries, including Hong Kong and Japan, which together import more than three-quarters of the world's ivory. Since that notification, an estimated 40 tons of ivory were blocked in Burundi, failing a buyer for this notoriously illegal merchandise. Furthermore, the price at which it was offered was a fraction of the current, legal, market price.

(2) Some States Party to the Convention have done a very poor job indeed of enforcing it. A case in point has been Bolivia, officially called to order last year at the Conference of the Parties in Buenos Aires for issuing:

- false export permits,
- certificates of origin for species which have never existed in the country,
- and for other offences.

A delay was given to the Bolivian government to get its house in order and, in the meantime, assurance was given that the biggest and most obviously illegal export, that of crocodile skins, would be reduced by half.

Another example of a State Party to the Convention not enforcing it is that of the United Arab Emirates, which has been acting, among other such dealings, as a clearing house for the poached ivory being shipped from Burundi.

(3) The enforcement of CITES is of course not simple and, even though the CITES Secretariat has held a number of regional training seminars for enforcement personnel, the problem of identification of species, their parts and derivatives is often difficult. Many States have limited the number of ports of entry for wildlife products to make sure that trained personnel would be available.

(4) It must be realized that there will always be crooks around the world, and since some wildlife products are quite rare and therefore expensive--this is true of plants as well as animals--the temptation will always exist to circumvent the law. It must be remembered that "Operation Falcon", carried out by US enforcement personnel over many months, led to the arrest and conviction of several dozen persons implicated in illegal trade, mainly in Peregrine Falcons.

Interpretation, misuse and abuse

The Convention itself is not interpreted in the same way by all Party States, and I would like to mention specifically a number of examples.

The Conference of the Parties adopts recommendations at each of its meetings; some Parties consider that these recommendations are binding and others do not. A typical case in point is the recommendations legalizing the export of Nile crocodiles from Zimbabwe, in particular, and from an additional group of African countries under a quota system: this legalization has not been accepted by the US Management Authority.

Another case is the recommendation that I mentioned earlier concerning hunting trophies of Appendix I species, adopted by the Second Conference 7 years ago, which has not been implemented by some countries that still insist on deciding, through their Scientific Authority, whether the country of origin is endangering the species or not.

Finally, it is apparent that some countries, utilizing Article 14 of the Treaty, are applying stricter domestic legislation for reasons that are judged to be mainly political. This attitude has been challenged by a number of wildlife-producing countries, and in particular by the African nations 2 years ago. In the end, rather than tabling a formal recommendation last year at the Conference of the Parties, it was agreed that a sub-committee chaired by Zimbabwe would look at this problem of "stricter domestic legislation".

It is suspected by the producer nations that some of this "stricter legislation" may have been passed only to protect domestic industries or to placate domestic public opinion, for instance in the case of the European ban on the import of seal products. In fact, the Treaty is quite clear in this matter: Article XIV allows Party States to adopt stricter domestic regulations on trade than the Treaty provides for.

However, it is also obvious that such a clause in the treaty should not negate the spirit of the Treaty itself, which is to control trade while conserving wildlife. If, for example, domestic legislation were adopted in some country, banning all wildlife trade, it would certainly seem to be in contradiction to the very concept of CITES.

It is evident that, like many other inter-governmental treaties, CITES can be misused and abused.

Bilateral "agreements" are made between voting countries in the typical "trade-off" mechanism: one country pledging to vote in favour of the demands of the other, in exchange for a similar promise to the first Party. This, of course, brings politics to CITES, which is unfortunate, and it is hoped that, in future, matters of species conservation will be treated as scientifically as possible, the Plenary meeting of the Parties being there merely to accept or reject proposals passed on after screening by the Scientific Committee.

It is also obvious that CITES is getting more and more efficient, and that some Party States, in particular those having little or no experience in wildlife management, are being somewhat misled into the idea that exact numbers of wild animals and plants can be assessed, and that unquestionable trends in these numbers can be regularly made available for scrutiny. This is a dangerous notion, which is leading to the demand by Parties for ever more precise figures that can be obtained at best in an approximate way and at a huge cost in research, finances and people.

What would we do in the developed world if we were asked how many dandelions or rabbits we had on our nation's soil? The lack of an answer, of course, would only move CITES to forbid us to trade internationally in those species or their products, but we would not suffer economically very much from such a ban. It is, however, a different situation in developing countries where the export of wildlife products is sometimes an essential share of foreign currency earnings, as well as a provider of jobs and other socio-economic benefits.

It is therefore essential that suitably economical methods of estimating populations of wild animals and plants, and of indicating trends in these populations, be found. Wildlife management does not have to be based on exact knowledge; approximate figures are sufficient.

Our foundation (IFCG) believes that the best guarantee for the conservation of wildlife habitats is the very value of wildlife to society, and therefore that conservation trade in wildlife is to be encouraged.

Finally, a number of CITES observers like myself firmly believe that, when some State Party to the Convention suggests that trade of a given species or population of a species from another country be banned (i.e., moved up to Appendix I), then that State making the proposal should bear the onus of proof and eventually the financial cost of the research justifying such a measure.

Panel on "North American waterfowl management plan" (1)

INTRODUCTION OF PANEL MEMBERS

R. Andrews
Director of Wildlife, Alberta
Chairman of the Panel

(James Bourque, Deputy Minister, Renewable Resources, Northwest Territories, introduced the panel topic--the "North American waterfowl management plan"--and also Mr. Andrews.)

We have an exciting session ahead of us. The North American plan has been represented as "the conservation event in waterfowl since the signing of the Convention". I believe that it offers us a real challenge, a real opportunity to demonstrate what international co-operation, what international joint efforts are all about. The challenge is quite clearly going to be ours. We are all hoping that one year from now we will be standing here saying that we met it.

(Mr. Andrews then introduced the panel members and led the discussion which followed.)

Panel on "North American waterfowl management plan" (2)

A FEDERAL PERSPECTIVE

J. Patterson
Canadian Wildlife Service

The "North American waterfowl management plan", which was signed in Washington on 14 May, is really a blueprint. It is not a contract to start building yet, but we have identified a year in which we will pull together the various interest groups and launch a program in the spring of 1987.

I was pleased to hear references in the discussions to the link between the "World conservation strategy" and the "Waterfowl management plan". Certainly, if it is to succeed and accomplish the objectives contained in it, this must be a comprehensive soil, water and wildlife conservation undertaking, exactly as envisaged in the "World conservation strategy".

In a nutshell, the plan puts forth objectives for waterfowl populations in North America, taking into account all interests in the waterfowl resource. It defines habitat objectives that must be achieved, protected and enhanced, if those populations are to be reached. It develops harvest strategies where all of the jurisdictions in North America can work in a co-ordinated way to come to grips with difficult times, if a population is in difficulty, or conversely to share abundant populations. It has a firm policy statement on the legitimacy of subsistence hunting in the North and the need to involve northern subsistence users in continental waterfowl management. I think it includes all vested interest groups that must get together and work together to share in the resource and share in the conservation requirements needed.

Another thing it does is to put in place a process that guarantees that there will be consultation and co-operation. In the intergovernmental arena, the process in Canada has called for the creation of the Canadian Waterfowl Advisory Council, which has just had its first meeting.

The North American plan calls for the North American Plan Committee, which we hope will be meeting in mid-July. The Canadian members of that committee are: Barry Meadows, Maritimes; Don Simkin, Central Canada; Bob Andrews, Western Canada; Kevin Lloyd, Northern Canada; and Dennis Sherratt (Saskatchewan) and I as federal members.

Joint undertaking

In terms of where the action is going to be in the implementation of this plan, it is where all sectors, public and private, will be encouraged to join in the planning and implementation of the joint ventures mentioned in the plan. One of the successes so far, and the reason I believe we did complete a plan that got signed, is that at all stages the political leaders of this country were involved, all wildlife Ministers had to make the unanimous decision to move at every major step along the way. We have had dialogue and input from all of the NGOs as we have developed the plan, and a new spirit of partnership between the provincial, territorial and federal wildlife agencies. This must continue and I think this will be the basis of joint venture groups, and the basis of their implementation.

A lot of people have asked how on earth, in the mid-1980s, you can look at generating and spending $1.5 billion when countries are in such desperate economic straits. I think this is the only time to start something like this, because clearly there is not enough money in the coffers of either of the federal governments or of the provincial, territorial or state governments. We have to look at new innovative ways of pooling our resources; new innovative ways of establishing partnerships in delivering the program. I say this quite frequently, and I do not say it flippantly, but we do have a window of opportunity to get on with this major program. We have got the right mix of people in the public and private sector with the will to start.

We have an opportunity to work with the industries that are most affecting habitat. I am thinking primarily of agriculture and secondarily of forestry. In the agricultural sector, as you will hear from Senator Sparrow, the losses of soil through erosion, in one form or another, are most likely to be of more economic significance than the impacts of acid rain. In other words, erosion is a big economic liability to this country. Much of the reason that it is happening is that agriculture--and I am thinking primarily of the Prairies, but it could just as well apply to the potato-growing areas of the East, in particular of Prince Edward Island--through market forces has been pushed or led out into marginal lands, where up until now it has been economical to practice agriculture. Now the international grain markets have changed dramatically, and this is causing a grave situation, socially, economically and environmentally. What the plan in essence does is put a market value on waterfowl of $1.5 billion, and puts waterfowl into that equation.

I am suggesting that if, combined with the steps identified by Senator Sparrow and his crew, we address soil and water conservation through incentives to landowners to help them make the transition back from that marginal land, we double, triple or multiply that market force. Then the waterfowl, through the plan and other activities, become a lever to help generate that market force that we hope will allow the maintenance and creation of a healthier Canadian landscape.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Canadian Steering Committee: Bob Andrews represented the West, Kevin Lloyd the North, and Doug Roseborough the East; also, from the Canadian Wildlife Service, George Finney, and finally Bob Bailey, who was the co-ordinator. I would also like to thank Sandy Macaulay, who spent a year and a half with the Canadian Wildlife Service on an interchange program acting as the National Waterfowl Co-ordinator, and did a lot to get things in order so that we could have productive discussions with the United States.

Panel on "North American waterfowl management plan" (3)

A NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION (NGO) PERSPECTIVE

A.J. Macaulay
Chief Biologist
Ducks Unlimited Canada

I want to say at the outset that, while I will endeavour to present a representative NGO perspective, naturally some of the comments I will make, which probably come from a Ducks Unlimited Canada starting point, will not necessarily effectively represent the perspective which all non-governmental organizations would apply to the North American plan, although I have tried to anticipate what some of their views may be.

The involvement of non-governmental organizations in waterfowl management programs is essentially an add-on--and I do not mean this as a put-down to any of the NGOs--but essentially an add-on to the programs of federal and provincial governments, which have responsibility for managing the various aspects of this resource. The NGO can be considered a volunteer organization which lends assistance in a specific area of what is essentially a governmental responsibility.

Needing encouragement

The role of non-governmental organizations, as we all know, is somewhat varied, ranging from one of advocacy to public education to direct program input. To be successful at such a massive undertaking as the implementation of the "North American waterfowl management plan", governmental agencies will have to enlist the help of the interested NGOs which perform these varied roles. To maintain the NGO input that is so necessary, these groups must have encouragement from government. They must see leadership in terms of an objective-setting process and the identification of problems and appropriate solutions. In that fashion, the NGO is able, in essence, to identify a niche for itself that legitimizes, in the eyes of everyone, the activities which it proposes to undertake. I think the process of developing the North American plan to its present stage has amply demonstrated to everyone, NGOs included, just what can be accomplished with the strong co-operative leadership of our federal and provincial governments.

Another form of encouragement that is required to maintain that NGO interest is in the development by public agencies of programs which are complementary to those proposed by the NGOs. I might indicate here as a means of illustration such things as legislation and regulation which are congruent between resource-use sectors; congruent to the point where they avoid, for example, competing wetland conservation measures on the one hand and wetland drainage programs on the other. To those of you in the public sector, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this latter point, particularly in terms of its fund-raising appeal, which is the life-blood of an NGO. There is much in the way of warm feelings generated in the minds of the supporters of the non-governmental organizations when they feel that their particular organization has a role to play, and that the dollars that they contribute are being matched in a complementary fashion by those of the other actors involved.

I think we can make an analogy: somebody actually used the terminology in the previous session, saying that the North American plan is in essence a blueprint for action. It provides the holistic approach of establishing objectives; in this case for populations, habitat, and utilization of the waterfowl resource. It provides the total management concept within which the NGO component can identify its own niche in the process. Furthermore, in identifying problems and solutions, the North American plan also holds out to the "volunteer workers" the offer of assistance from the public sector, i.e., government agencies that have identified some of the legislative regulatory changes that are required. The plan spells out an administrative process, both domestically and internationally, which should give volunteer workers the feeling that the plan is well organized with strong leadership, but also provides the volunteers with the sense that, when necessary, their voice will be heard by the powers that be.

Additionally, the plan holds out to the private sector the promise that volunteer efforts will be matched by efforts within the public sector in areas such as policy modification and other functions which only the public agencies can perform.

To sum up then, the "North American waterfowl management plan", from an NGO perspective, represents a blueprint for action. The aggressive approach to developing a credible plan has been a very positive sign of leadership on the part of our wildlife agencies in this country. It has provided the management concept within which the NGOs can identify the niche that they can most usefully occupy, and it has offered assistance from the public sector in those areas where only public sector involvement is possible. And finally, by giving us all a set of common objectives and a framework within which to operate, the plan has given the non-governmental organizations the potential for new fund-raising appeal. However, it is only as good as the distance it has gone so far, and we have a long way to go in terms of implementation.

Implementing the plan

I would offer a few thoughts to those who are going to be key players in designing the implementation of this plan in its various aspects:

(1) We should begin to look very seriously at the sources of funding. Jim Patterson has mentioned the broad philosophy which is incorporated into the plan in terms of building the market force, and it is absolutely critical that in the process of identifying possible funding sources in the early implementation period, we begin to involve those sectors such as agriculture that will be essential partners if this is to be a success.

(2) We must begin to broaden the base of support for the plan in the next few months within the conservation community as a whole. Reference has been made to the "World conservation strategy", the Ramsar Convention, etc. Wherever the opportunity presents itself we must reinforce those links. Another way we can broaden the base of support is to engender the interest of those potential supporters who have interests in the species of waterfowl which currently are not prominent in the plan. I think, for example, of swans. These could be significant, although not necesssarily costly, efforts dealing with the management of Trumpeter or Tundra Swan populations. Trumpeters are particularly identified as a concern to the Saskatchewan government. I believe that this would generate additional support for the plan from naturalist groups--a sector of the public that is not currently stirred greatly by the plan.

(3) I think that we have to endeavour to design the long-term impact of the plan in such a way that it provides a maximally effective process for resolving problems

of managing waterfowl. We have to have some forum and a procedure for rationally coming to grips with problems such as the utilization of the resource, the sharing of the resource between countries and so forth. So, in developing the implementation strategy, we have to build with that in mind--that it has got to be an effective problem-solving tool.

(4) In applying the user-pay philosophy in subsequent phases of the implementation of this plan, we must ensure that no regional or users' disparities develop or are perceived to develop by the various client groups who have an interest.

My final suggestion would be, and this is basically building on an experience that the Steering Committee has had to date, that we must continue to work to a time-frame, adhere to deadlines and continually show progress towards the implementation of the plan. I firmly believe, and I think this is the perception of most of the non-governmental organizations, that if we can continue with the momentum that currently exists and keep some of these points in mind, it is indeed going to be a very exciting few years ahead of us.

Panel on "North American waterfowl management plan" (4)

AN AGRICULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Soil at risk

Hon. H.O. Sparrow
Deputy Chairman
Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Soil degradation is a serious national problem requiring national attention. It is extremely important that this message be brought to as many people as possible from coast to coast, urban and rural alike. Our country is facing the most serious agricultural crisis in its history and, unless action is taken quickly, Canada will lose a major portion of its agricultural capability.

In 1984, the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry established a subcommittee to study soils and soil conservation throughout Canada. Travelling across the country, gathering valuable information from individual farmers and organizations, the committee found that, while soil conservation work is under way, there is no general commitment and no overall plan for dealing with soil problems. The committee heard over and over again that most farmers are aware of the problems that affect their own land, but that they often have neither the financial resources nor the expertise necessary to overcome them. Overall, wherever the committee held its hearings, and subsequently at many other local meetings that I have addressed, the reaction has been the same: acknowledgement that problems do exist in their own region, surprise that similar problems exist elsewhere in the country, a desire to do something about them, and frustration because the resources required are not available.

Attempts have been made to establish the losses due to soil degradation across Canada. Estimates have been made that water erosion has caused annual topsoil losses as high as 30 t/ha in the Fraser Valley of British Columbia, yields have been reduced by up to 66% on severely eroded lands in Ontario and in New Brunswick, and land in row crops can erode at rates as high as 100 t/ha/year. Conservative estimates of the dollar loss due to water erosion are $345 million per year.

Causes of loss

In my own part of the world, the Canadian Prairies, wind erosion is a major problem, particularly in southern regions of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, where crops have been completely wiped out during spring storms before seedlings become established. During the years of drought, when there has been no snow cover, wind erosion has also been a serious problem in the winter months. Wind erosion is also a problem in Eastern Canada. On Prince Edward Island, wind erosion accounts for considerable topsoil loss on potato lands. The organic soils of southern Quebec are being badly eroded by wind and, if nothing is done to reduce the rate of loss, these fertile soils could be lost within 20 years. The cost of yield losses and higher input costs due to wind erosion have been found to amount to around $250 million on an annual basis.

Salinization, particularly secondary or man-induced salinity, is a very serious problem, again in the Prairie Provinces, estimated to be increasing at a rate of 10 000 ha/year, with a cost estimated at $180 million. Along with compaction and acidification, which are more prevalent in the humid regions of the country, it is reasonably safe to say that almost every hectare of agricultural land in Canada is subject to one form of soil degradation or another; and at a cost, in my opinion a very conservative estimate, of $1 billion per year.

This figure does not include the off-farm costs of soil degradation. The actual effect of erosion on waterways is very serious and also very costly. In Ontario alone, it is estimated that the dollar cost of erosion on waterways, sedimentation of ditches, damage to inland lakes, reservoirs and channels was over $100 million for 1984. The actual cost of damage to wildlife, physiological stress on fish due to the clogging of their gills and the increase in their susceptibility to disease, or the chemical damage to aquatic life and habitats by herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers washed into the water resources, is incalculable.

The reaction of most Canadians to the soil problems that they read about in the newspaper, or to the blowing soils that they are shown periodically on television, is, "Well, it's a big country; even if these soils are damaged, there is always more land to bring into production". But maps can sometimes be misleading. Canada's total land area is 922 billion ha, but only 7% of this is suitable for farm land. "Prime" agricultural land represents only 0.5% of the country's area. "Dependable" land, land not seriously constrained by climate or soil type, covers about 5% of the total land mass. The remainder is either too far from markets or is in areas that are not climatically suited to agriculture.

Agricultural lands in Canada are finite. They do not go on forever and must be conserved to the best of our ability.

National program

To date, in Canada, a comprehensive national soil conservation policy has not been developed. This is due, in part, to the shared federal-provincial jurisdiction over agriculture, and the fact that, while the provinces have jurisdiction over natural resources, the federal government has the research capability. Most provinces do have programs that attempt to deal with local problems, some of them very successful, and the federal government does have agreements with provinces to treat specific problems, but there remains no full-scale national program.

Such a program must be developed carefully, and must contain a number of elements. It must be site-specific, low-cost and cost-effective. It must also be designed to complement the knowledge and the expertise of the farmer, because it is not the bureaucrats and the scientists who can save the soil resource. It is the farmers with their closeness to, and their understanding of, the land who can and must conserve the soil.

In "Soil at risk", the committee made a number of recommendations with this in mind. They recommended:

- that the federal and provincial governments allocate more funding to soil conservation programming and research, including technology transfer;
- that financial incentives be provided to farmers to help defray conservation costs;

- that a "Council on soil and water conservation" be established to provide a forum for the discussion of soil conservation issues, and to make policy recommendations on soils to all levels of government;

- that land-use legislation be enforced; and

- that a comprehensive federal and provincial soil and water conservation policy be developed and adopted, which would clearly state governments' intentions to make soil conservation a priority in the development of all their policies, programs and projects.

I am pleased to say that a number of the committee's recommendations have come to fruition. Soil conservation was put on the agenda of the First Minister Meeting in November of 1985. Soil Conservation Week was declared first in May 1985 and again in May 1986. A national conference on soil conservation was held in April of this year in Saskatoon and, in the January 1986 budget, soil conservation was one of the few areas in Agriculture Canada to receive increased funding.

The Senate Committee has since studied the issue of herbicide pricing in relation to soil conservation. It issued a short report last winter suggesting methods of decreasing chemical costs for all farmers, but with specific attention to those using conservation practices. The committee waits impatiently for at least the spirit of its other recommendations to be acted upon.

Growing awareness

I am pleased to say that, since the release of the Senate Committee's report, "Soil at risk," many urban dwellers have become aware of the plight of Canadian agricultural lands. This has come about to some extent through media follow-up on the report, and through a major effort on the part of the committee to make the report available to schools and community groups. I believe that, because soil conservation is becoming an issue amongst the electorate, the federal and the provincial governments have become more positive in their approach towards soil conservation. I hope that this approach will continue and broaden.

One of the weaknesses of human nature is to be inward-looking, to see what matters directly to you and not beyond. I have mentioned that initially this was the attitude that the Senate Committee found in the different regions of Canada. Canadians now are beginning to realize that we need each of the parts of Canada to make up our country. All of Canada's land must be cared for and conserved. The same philosophy can be applied in a broader context. Each country must look after its own soils, but we all have to look after the soils of the world as a whole. To allow one area to fall into a state of irretrievable degradation may not be catastrophic in itself, but the possibility that this might happen again and again is frightening. Soil degradation is a problem that we must face farm-by-farm,province-by-province, nation-by-nation.

There is a need to approach any change with caution and not to expect everything to work immediately. Although soil problems may be recognizable, it is difficult to radically change traditional farming practices overnight. Nevertheless, to ignore the urgency of the problem is to ignore the prospects for our children's future.

Panel on "North American waterfowl management plan" (5)

A UNITED STATES PERSPECTIVE

H.K. Nelson
Regional Director (Minnesota)
US Fish and Wildlife Service

I have been involved in waterfowl management and research planning for many years. We started on the US "National waterfowl management plan" in 1964; the 17th version was finally endorsed by the Flyway Councils and approved by the Director, USFWS and the Secretary of the Interior in 1979. It takes time and patience. I know that CWS went through the same process for several years in the preparation of your national plan. During the development of these national plans, the need for a "North American waterfowl management plan" began to surface. Today we have that plan, approved 14 May 1986, and are entering the implementation phase. We in the USFWS consider this to be one of the most significant international resource management achievements in recent years.

Proving its value

The signing of the "North American waterfowl management plan" has helped to emphasize the Service's strong commitment to national and international waterfowl management. This important document and the goals it expresses have already proved valuable in dealing with the Service's day-by-day business. We have been able to use earlier drafts of the plan to help focus our management, research, and habitat acquisition efforts as we have moved forward with new emphasis in these programs.

Much of this new emphasis resulted from a Directorate meeting we held in Sacramento, California in January 1985, which was devoted entirely to a re-evaluation of our total migratory bird program with emphasis on waterfowl. High priority management and research needs were identified, program adjustments were recommended, and the necessary policy changes and budgetary support required were initiated. Some of the activities addressed were:

- increased emphasis on more intensive management of public lands and private lands to maximize waterfowl production in the principal breeding range;
- new research initiatives to test and enhance our capabilities to increase waterfowl production;
- strengthening of our technical capabilities in gathering and analyzing population data;
- specific research on certain species populations;
- more effective methods for handling disease problems;
- continued research to better understand the population dynamics of the principal species of waterfowl; and
- the need for a better understanding of brood survival and recruitment rates.

That meeting also directed special emphasis towards increased co-operative efforts with the US Department of Agriculture in formulation of the new 1985 farm bill (Farm Security Act of 1985). We are excited about the conservation provisions being incorporated in the bill which was passed. Conservation titles such as the "Conservation reserve", "Sod buster" and "Swamp buster" encourage private landowners to apply proper land-management practices that will benefit erodible uplands and wetlands. It will deny government subsidies for putting highly erodible land or wetlands into crop production, and provide incentives for keeping such areas in a more natural state.

The "Conservation reserve" feature is designed to take approximately 50 million acres of marginal farm land out of production and put in suitable cover that will reduce erosion and increase cover for wildlife. There is also a farm debt restructuring feature whereby farms that are undergoing foreclosure or retention by the Farmers Home Administration may obtain relief by allowing easements on marginal lands of those farms to be managed for conservation purposes. Some of these lands may be turned over to state or federal agencies for management. These provisions have been achieved by working with the US Department of Agriculture and emphasizing basic soil and water conservation measures that also recognize practices beneficial to fish and wildlife.

Implementation of many of these features of the 1985 farm bill is now under way, but much remains to be done to fully utilize these provisions and to assure continuous funding.

Other initiatives

There are a number of other US actions which I would like to enumerate and elaborate on further:

(1) Strengthened technical support for waterfowl population collection and data analysis.

(2) Policy changes to emphasize intensive management of Service lands (refuges and waterfowl production areas) to maximize waterfowl production. Continued research and development conducted by the Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center at Jamestown, North Dakota and the Mid-Continent Waterfowl Project at Fergus Falls, Minnesota.

(3) Increased emphasis on wintering habitat requirements and further consideration of deficiencies occurring on key migration areas.

(4) New research emphasis directed at problems of mutual concern in the USA and Canada.

(5) Proposed budget increases in FYs 1987 and 1988 to support additional management and research efforts, as I mentioned in my earlier presentation.

(6) Continued research for other alternatives to land acquisition to encourage protection of privately owned wetlands. Some examples are tax initiatives for landowners, matching state grant programs as being initiated by Minnesota and Tennessee to protect wetlands and improve cover, and procedures for better co-ordinating mutual interests and pooling funds of private organizations willing to participate in waterfowl habitat programs.

(7) Improved water development on waterfowl production areas statewide through the co-operative program with Ducks Unlimited in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Montana and Alaska.

(8) Implementation and funding of the Ducks Unlimited state "Matching-grant wetland protection and development program", known as MARSH.

(9) Continued promotion of additional federal wetland protection legislation by Congressional interests which would provide additional funding for federal and state wetland preservation programs.

(10) Updating of the US "National waterfowl management plan" to conform with the "North American waterfowl management plan".

(11) New focus on flyway plans and species plans in the USA as international needs and co-operative efforts are better identified.

(12) Updating of the "Environmental impact statement on migratory bird hunting in the United States" (1975), which is scheduled for completion in 1987.

Population studies

I want to emphasize again two subjects that I touched on in the US Fish and Wildlife Service annual report. (Included in these Transactions.)

Waterfowl population management Analysis of data from the stabilized hunting regulations period is being completed this year in co-operation with CWS and other co-operators. We expect to have a full final report of results for general distribution by the end of December 1986. Results of the stabilized regulations studies and other information will be incorporated in a new "Environmental impact statement", covering the migratory bird hunting program in the United States, for public review by June 1987. In that document, we will articulate our harvest management philosophies, including any adjustments based on new information. Information from these studies and evaluation will be essential for future management of migratory bird populations.

Black Duck management We have all been concerned about the continued downward trend in Black Duck populations over the past 15 years. Winter survey results from 1986 in both the Mississippi and Atlantic flyways show an increase in Black Duck numbers from 1985 population levels. The Mississippi Flyway is currently 11% above the 1976-85 average, whereas the Atlantic Flyway is presently 5% below the average for those same years. While our currently planned harvest reduction program for Black Ducks will not end until 1988, and will be reported on in 1989, we intend to take a hard look at population status and harvest levels as soon as harvest information is available for the past season. Changes in harvest regulations this past year may have reduced the harvest in some states. Further adjustments will be made as necessary, as we must follow closely the status of this species. The next significant steps on behalf of Black Ducks will be to attempt to initiate the joint ventures called for with Canada under the "North American waterfowl management plan".

Thus, the "North American waterfowl management plan" provides a firmer policy framework and a better co-operative basis for waterfowl management in the USA and Canada, and substantiates the need for more effective international co-operation. We are hopeful that Mexico will soon become an active partner. I believe the plan especially enhances our co-operative management role with the 50 states through the Flyway Councils and the states and the many private organizations involved in waterfowl management in North America. The plan recognizes that change has occurred in Canada, as it did earlier in the US prairies, and that remedies are not simple and will be costly. I believe it will also go a long way towards helping to recognize and understand the enormous co-operative task required to cope with the many management problems confronting waterfowl biologists, wildlife managers, administrators, hunters and other users of the waterfowl resource.

There are a number of implementation details that need to be worked out soon, such as establishment of initial priorities and reasonable milestones, initial funding arrangements for immediate tasks, guidelines for proposed joint ventures and further consideration of the strong role non-governmental organizations must play in accomplishing the objectives of the plan.

There is a tremendous job to be done. I am looking forward to the appointment of the 12 members of the North American Waterfowl Plan Committee this month and the first meeting of the committee during August 1986, as we begin to deal with implementation of provisions of the plan. I am also looking forward to some exciting times during the next 5 years as other aspects of the plan progress.

Panel on "North American waterfowl management plan" (6)

A NATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Hon. D. Porter
Minister of Renewable Resources
Yukon Territorial Government

Your program clearly indicates that what is expected of me is the perspective of native or aboriginal Canadians. I would have to qualify that understanding because I do not think that there is any individual in the native community who can give a single perspective as to how an issue affects a group of people. However, I think that I can give you a perspective from a Northern aboriginal point of view.

I grew up in the North. I was raised in a small community. The early part of my existence with my family consisted of engaging in the subsistence economy--hunting, fishing, trapping. My father ran a big-game outfit as did my uncle. So, from that perspective, I think that I can share with you a point of view that maybe too often you have not heard. As well as my personal experience in living and growing up in the North, I have had the pleasure of being able to travel to the Northwest Territories and work in the Mackenzie Valley, and have had extensive travels in the State of Alaska, and I have had discussions on the question of subsistence with aboriginal Alaskans on many occasions.

What those travels and those discussions have reinforced in my mind is the need for international co-operation in management of renewable resources. I think that we, in the Yukon, are more and more convinced that when we are going to talk effectively about management of any particular resource, we are going to have to do so from an international perspective, be it waterfowl, be it caribou, be it general maintenance of the land, or the air quality. All of those issues we are going to have to get our heads around collectively.

Recently, I was fortunate to be able to chair a session of the "World conservation strategy". In that workshop, we discussed the needs of the Circumpolar region of the world. One of the prime recommendations that came out of our workshop was a clearly identified need for the Circumpolar countries to develop a Circumpolar strategy. Both the Northwest Territories Minister and myself were in attendance, and both of us have agreed to immediately follow that up with discussions with our Alaskan counterparts by attendance at the ICC conference. That is something that we have committed ourselves to work out. It may take years, but I think that clearly that is what is needed.

Current inequities

In terms of the specific questions related to the "North American waterfowl management plan" which is before us, I will be very short. I think that the plan is excellent. I think it is businesslike. I think it is pragmatic and it is going to work. But they key thing in terms of it working with the consent of the people of the North is to recognize current inequities that exist between ourselves and other users. You are all aware that the North does provide habitat for a majority of the geese, and clearly it is the prime habitat area for a good number of the various species of ducks. However, when you look at the ability of Northerners to share in the resource, we have a very lopsided relationship with Southern Canadians and Americans.

A major reason for this is the international Migratory Birds Convention Act, which everyone knows was established in 1916, and which effectively fixes the hunting date of 1 September. Unfortunately, by then the geese and ducks have already left many parts of Northern Canada and Alaska, thereby depriving us, from our perspective, of an equitable share in the resource. So, in terms of involvement of Northern Canadians and Northern Alaskans, I think that question has to be addressed. Either we take the route of direct renegotiation of the Convention itself, or we make a move to bringing about a protocol that has the effect of amending the content of the Migratory Birds Convention Act to allow flexibility in terms of seasons and harvests. What we could be talking about is a harvest in early spring, when part of the birds are nesting, as well as an earlier harvest in the fall when part of them are leaving. When you look at it from the perspective of the rights of the subsistence users, I think it makes a lot of sense as well.

Our information in the discussions that we have had with the people in the State of Alaska is that, through the operation of a court decision, they may very well have to be looking at implementing a spring hunt in that particular state next year. If we simply allow the legal process to determine management decisions for us, I do not think that is a wise use of the responsibilities that have been entrusted to us by the people we represent. So, the message is very clear from our perspective in that we favour the drafting and agreement of a suitable protocol that will have the effect of amending the treaty to allow for harvesting rights.

Consultation

I think that, as we are doing this, we have to consult the aboriginal people of the North. Consultation has to be real, it simply cannot be a Tri-Star flying over a reserve and waving its wings as it goes by. I think that not only do we have to talk to the subsistence users and keep them abreast of what the intentions of governments are, but we have to commit ourselves to direct involvement of the aboriginal subsistence users in the management of the resources.

If you look at current issues that are developing in the North, one of the clear issues that we are going to have to decide on, and in the western Arctic we have already made some decisions on, is the settlement of aboriginal claims. When you examine what happens at the conclusion of those talks, you will find inevitably that the aboriginal people have become very large landowners. For the most part, from the aboriginal perspective, it is simply a legitimization of what they think right now is legally theirs.

Nonetheless, the fact remains that there are vast tracts of land involved that in many cases would contain critical habitats for various wildlife resources. I think it is good business sense to involve the aboriginal groups from the beginning. My understanding in discussions with the Alaskans is that, with respect to waterfowl, there has been a tendency, largely in California groups and the subsistence communities in Alaska, to move towards that direction and we applaud that.

So, in terms of the plan itself, we congratulate both of the parties that have been involved in the negotiations leading up to the signing in Washington. We think that the efforts have been very positive, have been very fruitful. We look forward to working with the governments, both of the federal governments in the United States and Canada, in drafting the necessary management plans so that we can better look after the resources that we have been entrusted with, not only for the present generation but for all of those that will follow.

Panel on "North American waterfow management plan" (7)

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Hon. C. Maxwell
Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources
Saskatchewan

We have had recently three main thrusts in Saskatchewan aimed at wildlife. First of all, we passed a Critical Habitat Wildlife Protection Act, and put 1.2 million acres (500 000 ha) of Crown land into it. It says that nobody gets to mess around with that land unless they get the Minister's permission first. We are looking to put another 1.8 million acres (730 000 ha) of habitat in there.

The second thing --I just got it through this spring in the Legislature--was an amendment to the Wildlife Act to stiffen the penalities for poaching, night-hunting and trafficking. I had gone through the province, had done a lot of media stuff and met with lots of groups. I talked to the Natural History Society and we got their support. The 35 000 members of the Canadian Wildlife Federation in Saskatchewan rallied right behind us and passed a resolution at their convention, unanimously, saying that they wanted stiffer penalities. On the day I was doing second reading in the Legislature, I made sure that I had the entire executive of the Wildlife Federation sitting up there in the gallery, and I introduced them before question period.

So we have an act now that says if you are caught poaching in Saskatchewan--we are not talking about the poor people out there getting a deer for the family table, but if you are raping and plundering our wildlife--it is going to cost you $5000. If you get caught night-hunting in Saskatchewan, it is going to cost you $5000. If you get caught trafficking in wildlife in Saskatchewan, it is going to cost you $25 000, with, at the option of the magistrate, 2 years in jail to go along with it.

The third prong in our thrust on wildlife is the "North American waterfowl management plan". I am totally committed to this plan and so are the officials in my department--we see no losers there. It will benefit not only the conservationists, not only the hunters, but also the farmers and, most important of all, we will be benefiting our waterfowl and the thing that Herb Sparrow is talking about, habitat.

Ready to go

There is only one argument when you talk about wildlife. If you can knock down the poaching and get control of it, there is only one issue, and that issue is habitat. Whether it is for wildlife or waterfowl, habitat is disappearing at an alarming rate, and we are going to stop that in Saskatchewan and do something about it. We have the funding in place and we are ready to go. We want to sign the plan. We want to see it come to fruition. We are not prepared to sit back and just dilly-dally and cry the blues and complain about it. It is up to people like you and me to work together with the missionary zeal that I know you can muster up if you think about it.

We have Ramsar coming up in Regina next year: what better forum, what better place, to sign the "North American waterfowl management plan", and say it is unanimous? All the provinces are in and the federal government is in, and let us not put up with any more arguments about why we cannot do it. It is up to all of us to get out there, get the message across, get it done, and deliver it at Ramsar next June. You are all invited to be there, at what I assume now will be the signing ceremony, whereby we all commit ourselves to the "North American waterfowl management plan".

Panel on "North American waterfowl management plan" (8)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

A.J. Macaulay (Ducks Unlimited Canada),addressing a question to the Hon. Colin Maxwell, said that the details of the Saskatchewan government's commitment to the "Waterfowl management plan", its implementation, had not received the amount of coverage and profile that a commitment like this would seem to suggest was warranted. He asked Mr. Maxwell to give them some details of the Cabinet decisions that had been taken.

Hon. C. Maxwell (Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources, Saskatchewan) replied that the item he had taken to Cabinet called for an expenditure of approximately $3.28 million over each of 15 years; so they were looking at $45-48 million spread over 15 years.

J. Patterson (Canadian Wildlife Service) said that they had heard Senator Sparrow and a number of others talk about the link between "Waterfowl management plan" implementation and agricultural sustainability, and asked Mr. Maxwell how much that link had to do with the favourable Cabinet decision in Saskatchewan.

Hon. C. Maxwell replied that it had a lot to do with the decision, once it was explained to Cabinet. They were a basically rural agrarian society in Saskatchewan, and fortunately had a Premier who had a doctorate in agricultural economics and was an active farmer. They had had a lot of support around the Cabinet table for it. They had discussed the implications for agriculture, the benefits to farmers, and the habitat protection it would be providing to waterfowl.

R. Andrews, Chairman (Alberta Fish and Wildlife Division) said that, as he had indicated in his opening remarks, the "North American waterfowl management plan" clearly put in place a process wherein every opportunity was there for international co-ordination and joint international efforts to manage the resource. The real work--the nuts-and-bolts of exactly what was to be done, what they were trying to do, how they were going to do it, who was going to pay for it, how they were going to be accountable, and how they would demonstrate success--was yet to be laid out. He thought they could see a momentum building, both in Canada and in the United States, that gave good reason to believe that they were going to take advantage of this process and meet the challenge.

What they needed to do, he continued, was to address, with some discipline, some of the outstanding issues. They had heard of the inequities with respect to northern access to the resource. Clearly that was one of the outstanding issues that had to be addressed. It was where their geese came from. If they expected those people to show stewardship in the long run, it was only natural and reasonable that they find a way of providing equitable access. They were going to need many champions to do this, were anxiously waiting to see some champions emerge in the United States, and had every reason to believe that the capability, as well as the challenge, was clearly there. They all hoped that they would shortly start to form up in terms of identifiable bodies and major commitments in the foreseeable future.

H. Schwenk (Alberta Wildlife Advisory Council), making comments in line with Senator Sparrow's address, said that, in his book, the Senator had identified very well the problem of soil degradation in this country. The speaker fully agreed with the comments about soil degradation and about wildlife habitat being very closely linked with that. Being an agricultural producer, he saw the problem first-hand every day. It was not a problem that was easily solved, but it had been identified. What they needed now was to have someone figure out a strategy that was going to do something about the problem while there was still some time to do it. There were very efficient, well-educated agricultural producers in this country at the present time; they could produce a lot of food and do it very economically. However, in the total picture, someone was not looking far enough ahead into the future, because those well-educated agricultural producers, and also the well-educated policy developers, in this country needed to start figuring out a strategy to produce that food and still maintain their soil base, and maintain and enhance the wildlife habitat which had to go with it. The "North American waterfowl management plan" was right on track. The problem with soil degradation was that he could not see the proper incentives around to motivate people to look after the land properly. The incentive was there to make a living.

It was a problem of their total society, he continued, not just a problem of agricultural producers. Governments did not really act, they reacted. They had to get society stirred up enough to start demanding that different programs and incentives be designed for the long-range effect of preserving their land base, which was the important thing. The rest of the things could grow from that. If the land base had gone, as Senator Sparrow pointed out, there was nothing left. What the Keynote Speaker had indicated as happening over in Africa, could happen anywhere in the world.

J. Patterson said that he appreciated those comments very much because they were right on. That was exactly the approach being prescribed in the "Waterfowl management plan", working with the landowner and the agricultural industry to provide some of the incentives, as a lever to create and maintain a healthy Canadian landscape, and waterfowl were one of the products of that landscape. The only way it could be done was to ensure that they embarked on broad-spectrum soil, water and wildlife conservation initiatives that were economically viable to the landowner. The plan was getting positive reactions from some very interesting quarters, such as the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion, Department of Agriculture and PFRA, because it called for an integrated approach to land management. Implementation of the plan would in effect establish a market value for waterfowl; linking it with soil and water conservation initiatives would constitute a conservation market force to provide incentives to landowners to help resolve a broad spectrum of environmental and economic problems. He fully expected that those incentives could not be raised by any individual sector, but by all working together.

D. Munro (Naivasha Consultants) said that it was not very often that a wildlife conference or any other conference heard of a political commitment like the one they had just heard from Colin Maxwell. They spent a lot of time saying that one of the reasons why they did not succeed in accomplishing what they wanted was a lack of political will, yet they had just seen a very outstanding example of that. They had found a sort of handle to what they wanted to do that reflected an integrated approach to resource management. He did not think that the political will would have been developed if they had simply been talking about a single-purpose activity. This was the first really substantive commitment to the plan in any jurisdiction anywhere in North America. If that was true, they should make sure that they reported it at home, and used it as a lever to ensure that other commitments flowed from this. He hoped that the Recommendations Committee would pay some attention to this happening as well.

B. Andrews hoped that the Ministers of the Crown in Ottawa would pay particular attention to the challenge and leadership that Colin Maxwell had shown. However, he did not think this plan was going to be able to be financed through leverage; it was going to require federal dollars. The whole CWS program, he hoped, was not one of multipliers or of bait, but, in terms of waterfowl, they were looking for a plan of solid commitment with dollars. He concluded by thanking the panelists.

Canada's international image (1)

INTRODUCTION

A summary

D. Neave
Wildlife Habitat Canada
Chairman of session

This final session is entitled: "How do we optimize our efforts in world wildlife conservation?" It is designed to allow us to look at Canada's international image. I have very limited experience in international conservation, and have attended only a few small meetings on the international scene, but I was very impressed with their business-like and extremely structured approach in dealing with high-stake issues; perhaps not the norm to most of us in our wildlife meetings in Canada. After listening to Canadian delegates returning and reporting on international meetings, somewhat disillusioned and frustrated, I suggest that perhaps we are not only poorly equipped, but that there appears to be quite often a lack of a positive team effort.

The second point I would like to make deals with the definition of issues. Our solid conservation approach is interpreted differently by various international communities. While we are often told our reputation is outstanding, our philosophy in wildlife management of permitting the use of wildlife is considered by some as barbaric, and to others our scientific approach is seen as compromising and a weakness. As you all know, Canadian wildlife management is subject to these outside forces. We must endeavour to work at these international interests to ensure that wildlife remains an important element of the Canadian economy and of our way of life.

Just to set the tone for this session, I would like to direct your thinking by asking a few basic questions. What is our return for the time and money we contribute to international conservation? What is the cost? How can we more effectively spend this commitment? Should our contribution towards international conservation be increased or decreased, and why? There are many questions that we would ask, but this is your job during the workshop.

(Mr. Neave then introduced Dr. David Munro, Kirk Smith and the workshop chairpersons, and led the discussion periods.)

CANADA'S INTERNATIONAL IMAGE IN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

A summary

D. Munro
Naivasha Consultants

It is very appropriate for this conference to provide the opportunity for a specific follow-up to the visit to Canada of the World Commission on Environment and Development and the "World conservation strategy" Conference, both of which have taken place during the past month. Thus I am very glad to be able to talk about Canada's international image.

Eugene Lapointe has said that CITES was still at an adolescent stage. His point can be extended by noting that all institutions evolve and mature. I think that this institution--the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference--is doing that by looking at the international dimensions of wildlife conservation this year. We have looked beyond our own borders in the past. In fact, we have always done so to a considerable extent, since one of the preoccupations of this conference has always been migratory birds and, if you consider issues relating to the management of migratory birds, you must take into account the factors that affect their management and welfare in other countries than Canada. But this is the first time that we have taken a broader look at international conservation and I think it is very timely and appropriate.

Points of view

The first thing to say is that no nation has a single image in the eyes of its neighbours. We have many images. In fact the image perceived depends very much on the point of view of the beholder, on what his or her interest is. For example, in your discussion of CITES, you heard several different points of view with respect to Canada's image. It was said, for example, that the Canadian delegation came across as a team that was poorly organized, and that we looked like a mean-spirited group interested primarily in exploitation of resources. It was said by others that Canada's concern was to protect the concept of wise use; that, in any event, CITES was a convention to regulate trade, not primarily a wildlife management convention.

There is probably some basis for all those statements, but the emphasis that is given to any one depends upon the point of view of the person who is speaking. I think that this is true with respect to almost any subject you care to choose. So, because Canada is so vast, and because of the varied interests of Canadians and of people that look at Canada, we cannot project a single image. In fact, as I said before, there really is no single true image of Canada.

Let us look a little more closely at the several images; in fact, at the several realities of Canada that are relevant to our role in international conservation. I think that Canada may be unique as perhaps the best example of a country that is both developed and developing. It is politically expedient to divide the countries of the world into blocs, developed and developing, East and West, North and South, and so on. Canada is generally accepted as being a Western country, a developed country, a country of the North, but the fact is that we are still, to a very substantial extent, a developing country. This reality affects our interests and the way in which we present those interests in different international fora.

The concern that we have for utilizing our resources--for converting them into capital in order to carry out our social programs and to progress and develop our institutions--is reflected in many of our policies and programs. We are also a country that has a very advanced educational system, a high level of literacy, and a high degree of competency in technical subjects. As a result, we have been among the leaders in developing technologies for industry and for resource management, and in formulating concepts for good management of the environment. These two characteristics have sometimes put us in a position where we expound concepts with respect to conservation that are at least as advanced as those of any country in the world, and yet we fail at home to put fully into practice what we expound.

We have heard a most excellent presentation by Mrs. Bata, in which she gave her perception of where Canada might expand its international conservation efforts. She was speaking from a perspective that reflected two things. One was her conviction that wildlife, wild lands, genetic diversity, the effective functioning of ecosystems, the sustainable use of resources, in fact all the elements that are the subject of the principles of the "World conservation strategy", are terribly important. As a consequence of her personal experience in various parts of the world, she was also fully convinced that it would not be possible to achieve conservation throughout the world unless something was done to relieve poverty, to diminish the imbalance in welfare and security between the rich parts of the world and the poor parts of the world.

I believe that that message is the single most important message that can be brought to any group of people. Canada has the capacity to do much more to improve the welfare of the world--to advance conservation and therefore to advance our chances of survival--than almost any other country. We are an exceedingly fortunate country, not only because of our economic base and the sort of people that we have, but also because of our position in the world. We are not cursed with the stigma of power. The United States and the Soviet Union, the two leading countries of the world, do not have the freedom of action that a country like Canada has.

Being prepared

One point made here several times is that it sometimes seems that Canadian delegations are not as well prepared as they should be, that they seem to be a little lost in the rough-and-tumble of international negotiations. This may happen from time to time. I have been involved with a number of Canadian delegations to international meetings and I have not personally seen such situations, but if it does happen from time to time the remedy is no great mystery.

I clearly recall the preparations for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972. This was a conference which reflected very well on Canada because the Secretary General of the conference was a Canadian, Maurice Strong, and because the Canadian delegation was very active and had a great deal to do with drafting and securing the acceptance of the very progressive principles that constituted the Stockholm Declaration. The point is that the preparations for that conference were a model. The preparatory process involved a continuing round over a period of several years of interdepartmental meetings at the federal level, to work out positions on various issues. Background papers that were being prepared by the

Secretariat for a period of a year or 18 months before the conference were subject to careful review by many officials. As well, there were detailed federal-provincial consultations to ensure that a Canadian position was developed. It was all very professionally done and worked well.

So what should we do to improve our image at international conferences? Whenever a Canadian delegation has to take part in an international negotiation, make sure that the preparation is sufficiently comprehensive and extensive, and ensure that the approach is professional.

The point that I would like to emphasize in closing picks up on what Mrs. Bata said. We should strive to adopt positions which have two underlying objectives. One is to try to redress the balance between haves and have-nots, to establish equity among the peoples of the world; because, without that there is no security. and without security, without global security, there is in the end no chance of ensuring that we will have a world with resources that can be used sustainably. Secondly, we should try to ensure that our objectives are those which will lead to true conservation of resources. I think we should look at our positions in respect to all international issues with those two objectives in mind.

In the workshops, you may consider, perhaps more specifically, how we may improve our image, how we may work more effectively for world conservation. I suggest that you keep in mind these two objectives: (1) the welfare of the people of the world; and (2) the continued and sustainable use of our natural resources.

Canada's international image (3)

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

J. Berryman (International Association of Fish and Game Agencies) said that, in the previous session, they had heard some rather caustic views of how Canada was seen from the standpoint of those who had a very strong philosophical view on the management and use of animals. He was commenting from the perspective of actually working with Canada, its provinces and its federal government, and thought that Canada and the USA had fish and wildlife resource management programs that were the envy of the world. They owed no apology to anyone for those programs. It was important to look not just at the alleged image, but at the actual performance of Canada and the USA in some international relationships.

The 1916 migratory bird treaty, he continued, was a model of co-operation and now, as had been explained, they had the "North American waterfowl management plan"--two nations agreeing at the highest levels of government on problems and a general approach to their solution. There were also the Great Lakes Commission and the Northern Pacific Fur Seal Convention; he was sorry to say that the United States had unilaterally backed out of the latter.

The USA, he continued, considered Canada as a dependable, mature and professional ally. They had worked together in opposing the signing of the Bonn Convention. They worked together on CITES. Canada was involved in a number of Latin American projects which he had not heard mentioned in connection with its poor image. Habitat Canada was a model of co-operation, something that the USA was looking at.

In any case, he thought that Canada was being criticized fundamentally for two reasons. One was its very stout defence of wise management, and the other was its defence of its own national interests. This was a tactic, then, to try and throw it on the defensive. His point was that he would urge a bit of caution before they put on this mantle of guilt and retreated to a defensive corner. It was not all deserved.

Update report

FUR INSTITUTE'S COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

A summary

K. Smith
Chairman, Public Information Committee
Fur Institute of Canada

Will the fur industry exist 10 years from now? Will there still be more than a 100 000 Canadians employed by this billion-dollar industry? Or will we see the growth of controversy with resulting import bans, fur coats out-of-fashion and massive unemployment? And, of course, the threat is not just to the fur industry, but to all primary producers: fishermen, farmers, hunters and trappers--to all those who are involved in the responsible harvesting and managing of wildlife--to each of you. Our society's fundamental belief that man has the right to the consumptive use of animals is being challenged.

We will have to muster all of our energies co-operatively and constructively to meet the next decade of challenge. Many think that we may not have even that much time. But, before we panic and shoot from the hip with action which is not well thought out, professional or long-term, let us remember that it took a decade to destroy the sealing industry. Our opponents now face a much more difficult task and we have a lot more going for us.

Environmental issues

People today care a great deal about the environment. Acid rain, nuclear radiation and the assimilation of deadly chemicals into our food chain are all issues of great concern. Along with this is an ever-increasing respect for animals within the environment. People react with repugnance and guilt over the now-obsolete and dysfunctional view that man can dominate and over-exploit all the living things on this planet. We have seen enough cruelty by people to animals and among our own kind. We need more respect for our fellow creatures and our fellow human beings. We must change our ways. If not, we will surely cause many more extinctions of plants, animals and perhaps ultimately our own species.

This is why the public reacts so strongly to images which convey cruelty and misuse of animals. However, the public does not know the difference between animal welfare and animal rights, between conservation and preservation. Our society simply needs guidance and leadership. The public is thirsty for education. This is an opportunity for the fur industry and all conservationists to step forward and assist in the search for new directions.

It is a great irony that those who live closest to nature have perhaps the deepest respect, care and understanding for animals and the environment. But these are not the people who are speaking out. We need to make our voices heard.

The fur industry is based on principles of conservation and animal welfare, which are perfectly "in sync" with today's emerging public attitudes. The majority of the public in Canada, as shown by public surveys, do not want animals to be over-exploited;

they want to know that the resource is professionally managed; they do not want any unnecessary cruelty; they do not want to see any waste of animal resources; they want to know that the end product is not frivolous, that it is practical and justifiable; and they want to know that the resource provides vital economic benefits.

The fur industry supports all of these concerns. We must publicly demonstrate that we do so. A thoughtful, professional and long-term communication, education and research program must be implemented to accomplish the task of demonstrating our commitment to these vital public concerns.

The Fur Institute's action plan

The Fur Institute of Canada (FIC) has been created to facilitate this task and provide comprehensive leadership for our industry. Government, trappers, the corporate sector, fur ranchers and native organizations cannot do the job alone. Working together we can.

The FIC now has 62 members representing a wide cross-section of the fur industry and related interest groups. We also have international membership through a variety of US organizations. We are a member of the International Fur Trade Federation. This extensive and diverse base of support is enabling the FIC to implement a comprehensive three-pronged trap research, trappers' education and communication program to ensure the long-term future of our industry.

The FIC's action plan is based on a comprehensive and professionally developed communication strategy. Its eight key principles, which follow, apply equally to the promotion of wildlife management and conservation.

1. Respond to public concerns

   We must understand and respond to the legitimate concerns of the general and consuming public. First, we must understand what those concerns are through opinion polling, consumer attitude research and focus-group analysis, then take steps to overcome the concerns that are identified and clearly communicate to the public the internal actions which are being taken. We must always keep in mind that the target audience for our message is the public, not our opponents.

2. See the big picture

   We must perceive our image in terms of evolving public attitudes towards people/animal relationships and the legitimate concerns which society has over the fragile ecology of which we are a part. To the degree that there is public support for an attack on the fur industry, it is only a symptom of widespread confusion about these basic issues. The fur industry and related groups can thus play a lead role in the search for new directions by our society.

3. Support our supporters

   Far too much time, energy and resources have been spent reacting in a defensive manner to the accusations and taunts of animal rights and preservationist individuals and organizations. It is in our best interests to take an assertive rather than an aggressive or defensive position. We should reach out to the great majority of the public which supports the conservation principles on which the fur industry is based. An honest education job is required.

4. Simplify the issues

   Facts are not enough, no matter how well packaged, to get our message across. Without demeaning ourselves, we must simplify the issues and add emotion. We must ask the public to weigh human rights against animals rights, to consider the welfare of animals with respect, caring and affection for other people. Is nature cruel? Are individual animals more important than the species as a whole? These are basic and simple questions which must be asked.

5. Be positive

   In all of our communication efforts, as individuals and as organizations, we must convey an attitude of confidence and dignity. We are proud of our contribution to the history, culture and economy of our country, and of our contribution to and protection of the environment.

6. Use credible speakers

   Sincerity, credibility, and accuracy are all important qualities which individuals, speaking on behalf of the fur industry and related issues, must possess. Media training should be provided wherever necessary. The "grass roots" forces must be mobilized.

7. Conservation repositioning

   There must be a legitimate repositioning of users' groups as supporters and fine examples of the present pro-ecology, pro-environment, and pro-animal welfare beliefs, attitudes and values of the general public. We must demonstrate that people who live closest to nature and who depend on the natural environment for their livelihoods have great respect for the animals and the environment. We must demonstrate our support for environmental and conservation issues, like acid rain, which are tangential to our immediate vocations. We must demonstrate that the fur industry is based on the ecologically sound use of a renewable resource, that our products are practical and that our use of animals is justified according to the value systems of today's consumer.

8. Facilitation

   The delivery of the fur industry message must be done not only by the FIC. There must be a high degree of co-operation with all related industries and organizations. The delivery of supportive themes and messages from a wide range of sources will provide strength through diversity, credibility and continuous reinforcement.

Based on these fundamental communication principles, the FIC has developed its three-pronged trap research, trappers' education and communication programs, addressing all of the basic public concerns that have been revealed through research, which include the following.

1. Trap research

   We have a trap research program because, like every other major industry, we must respond to legitimate criticism. We must find better ways to harvest animals in the wild. Our research facility in Vegreville, Alberta is the finest of its kind, where both quick-kill and live-hold systems are all being tested in both laboratory and field settings. Because of this program, we can tell the Canadian and world publics that if there are ways to do a better job, we will find them.

2. Trappers' education

   The FIC is playing a lead role in this area too, to show that efficient use of existing systems increases the economic value of furs, and that changes in trapping practices make today's professional trapper an important part of the wildlife management team. The practice of regulated and humane harvesting must be encouraged and implemented right across Canada, and trappers must support this development by understanding that it is in everyone's best interest (as well as that of the animals).

3. Communication

   A comprehensive and professional communication program is far more than televised debates, letters to the editor and paid advertisements. We must reach a wide range of both internal and external audiences with first-rate education/information programs, and with positive themes and messages. The audiences include schoolchildren, journalists, opinion leaders, politicians, retailers, and trappers. The FIC's communication program encompasses all of these information needs on a national and international basis. We have produced a series of fact sheets on all sectors of the industry, as well as a corporate brochure. A comprehensive film is in production. Information kits for schools, the corporate sector, the media and trappers are being developed.

Optimism

It is going to be a long and difficult task, but there are many reasons to be optimistic about the outcome. Thus far, anti-trapping legislation in Europe has been prevented. Anti-trapping efforts have been less co-ordinated than expected. While anti-fur efforts have had successes, they have been sporadic on a country-by-country basis. We now have evidence from Europe that a number of the major countries which have been damaged by anti-fur activity are stabilizing and beginning to rebound. For example, we hear from the US that the market was up 25% this year. Our own industry is growing: up to 15% last year and up 15% again this year.

We do expect increased anti-fur activity in Canada and the United States with perhaps some effect on the market. We know we are vulnerable because our present strong market is linked to the devaluation of the Canadian dollar.

There has been a visible and positive shift in media coverage of the issue. One of the reasons for this development has been the emergence of the animal rights activists. The focus is now not just on wild fur, but on all sectors of our industry, and also on animal research, factory farming, zoos and meat production. However, there is an undercurrent of violence which is "turning off" both the public and the media. The idea that animals are somehow equal in value to human beings will remain an idea from the radical fringe with little public support. While our opponents are doing an excellent job of discrediting themselves, we are gaining support from all those groups which are also targeted for attack.

With concerted, co-ordinated action and sufficient resources, we will accomplish our goals. Together we can ensure a healthy future for the fur industry for generations to come. Together we can ensure that the conservation ethic continues to be a basic tenet of our society.

Summary of discussion

H. Schwenk (Alberta Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council) said that, as a farmer, he could see the long-range objective of the animal rights groups as probably to shut down the meat-producing industries as well; that there should be no killing of any kind of animal in the world, ever. He wondered how much work the fur industry had done in trying to get the support of agricultural producers and their organizations.

K. Smith (Fur Institute of Canada) thought the first step in that was recognition of the widespread nature of the threat and to address it as a large issue; secondly, to begin communicating. The Institute's last update of clippings from the United States, Canada and around the world showed that there really were as many threats to the farming industry as to the fur industry. They must not fight this battle on isolated fronts as individuals or on the basis of individual sectors of individual industries, but get their troops together and look at it on a widespread basis. There should be further discussion of this.

L. Mason (US Fish and Wildlife Service) said that an international meeting would be taking place in Switzerland in July, which was to develop the language for an international convention on animal rights. He asked if the Fur Institute would be attending that meeting and taking any active role in it?

K. Smith replied that the Fur Institute had a very large and active component in the last CITES meeting in Buenos Aires, and they and the entire Canadian contingent had established a non-governmental group that looked at that particular issue. The Institute was not attending the animal rights meeting in Switzerland, but was monitoring it and trying to offset these initiatives and make people aware of the threat.

K.A. Brynaert (Canadian Wildlife Federation) said that one of the dangers of attending that conference in Switzerland was that the letter of invitation had indicated that the original attendees at that meeting would be considered as the founding members of the convention. Certainly from the Canadian Wildlife Federation standpoint, and he believed also the Canadian government standpoint, they did not want to fall into that trap.

L. Mason added that he had heard perhaps as many as two dozen countries would be at the conference. There would be no US government group going there, and he believed none from Canada. It was a very tricky proposition, because it was not officially a government sanctioned or sponsored meeting, hence they as government need not respond to the invitation to be present. But it was not an issue that was going to die and therefore they needed, as had been suggested, to develop their positions down the road, because eventually a government would adopt it. It was likely to come out of that meeting and was likely to be Switzerland.

K. Smith said that they had spent some time talking with senior editors of various papers in the country, and much more of that needed to be done, not to particularly push the fur industry or be there for information reasons, but to educate them as to the fundamental distinction between animal welfare and animal rights. Animal welfare was something that they could certainly support, but animal rights was a fundamentally different departure, a leap over a line which inextricably led to violence.

B. des Clers (International Foundation for the Conservation of Game) thought, on the subject of the animal rights convention, that the only action to fight it really had been taken up to now by non-governmental organizations. It was defeated in Buenos Aires at the CITES meeting where the subject was raised, asking for CITES, which meant in fact the United Nations, to back this initiative. It was rejected, with the help of the government delegations, on the basis of being outside the scope of CITES. He wondered if it would be possible for governments who believed this thing to be bunk, and who presumably did have the information on this convention and on what was behind it, to help financially and so on, possibly through devious means, the non-governmental effort to fight it.

Workshops

1. EXPORT OF TECHNOLOGY AND FUNDS

Summary of Workshop 1 Chairman's comments

R.W. Roberts
Chief, Forestry Sector
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

Since I have been asked to chair this workshop on the "Export of our technology and funds", we will assume that CIDA is the major actor in that field. I will first describe the organization and operation of CIDA, then assess the product we are exporting by examining the capabilities of Canadian organizations to provide wildlife management skills, assess also the present involvement of Canadian conservation agencies in Third World development, and describe the activities of some other donors. From that I will draw some conclusions and present some suggestions to address the situation.

CIDA outlined

CIDA focuses primarily on three sectors of development: agriculture (including fisheries and forestry, with responsibility for parks and wildlife), energy, and human resource development. Assistance is provided through four main channels:

(1) The Bilateral Programs Branch deals at a government-to-government level, and projects here are initiated at the request of the host governments.

(2) The Multilateral Programs Branch supports the efforts of some 85 international organizations, such as the international financial institutions, the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED).

(3) The Business Co-operation Branch supports Canadian business efforts in the Third World.

(4) The Special Programs Branch, probably the most relevant to our present discussion, supports and encourages the initiatives of Canadian institutions and groups interested in international development. There are three programs run by this branch that may be of interest:

  (i) assistance to non-governmental organizations (NGOs);

  (ii) Management for Change, which emphasizes collaboration and sharing of information and experience between organizations in Canada and the developing world; a recent initiative encourages the twinning of Canadian municipalities with cities in the Third World;

  (iii) Institutional Co-operation and Development Services, which seeks to build collaborative relationships between organizations in Canada and developing countries.

CIDA and wildlife conservation

CIDA began providing assistance to wildlife conservation in 1963, and since that time has been involved in about 23 projects with a value of over $27 million. Three main observations may be made here:

(1) the bulk of the effort on wildlife has been concentrated on the African continent;

(2) a wide variety of aid channels have been involved, with the majority of the activity extended through bilateral agreements;

(3) recent activity suggests an increased trend in funding through multilateral and NGO agencies with an interest in conservation.

Assistance through bilateral projects has included advice on game harvesting and legislation development, lecturers in wildlife management, preparation of land-use classifications and the establishment of institutions.

The late 70s and early 80s saw an increase in the number of conservation-related NGOs receiving aid through Special Programs and Multilateral Programs branch channels. IUCN and IIED have been the main recipients since 1978, but others have included the Environmental Liaison Centre in Nairobi, the Caribbean Conservation Association, World Resources Institute (Washington), l'Environnement et Développement, Terre du Monde and the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) (Geneva). Money channelled through INGOs seldom goes directly to wildlife conservation.

The only Canadian NGO that is concerned primarily with wildlife conservation, and is presently receiving CIDA funding for an overseas project, is the African Wildlife Husbandry Foundation--a small missionary organization established specifically to operate the Nazinga Wildlife Project in Burkina Faso. This project and the building of a Natural Resources College in Malawi are CIDA's only wildlife-related projects at the moment.

Results of CIDA's wildlife involvement

Perhaps the most disappointing effort has been in Uganda, where wildlife populations have been slaughtered drastically during the many political upheavals in that country, suggesting that any positive results from Canada's involvement have been negated.

Attempts at institution building with the Kenya Rangeland Ecological Monitoring Unit (KREMU) and the Wildlife Planning Unit (WPU) have met with mixed success. Each of the units provided significant and useful contributions during the life of CIDA's involvement, but failed to establish a viable, self-perpetuating organization. We now know that institution building and strengthening require long-term commitments which are difficult for CIDA to make. Perhaps there is a role here for your federal and provincial agencies.

In Tanzania, CIDA's involvement has been definitely positive through training at the Wildlife College and providing professional assistance to the Serengeti Research Institute. Both of those institutions are internationally well known and respected.

Finally, CIDA's assistance to the IUCN, WCED and IIED should indirectly benefit wildlife through their general conservation programs such as the "World conservation strategy" (WCS). Also CIDA's contributions to INGOs encourage them to employ Canadian expertise, thus increasing the use of Canadians in their work.

Third World involvement of Canadian conservation organizations

International conventions and agreements such as CITES, Ramsar and the World Heritage Convention are the main avenues of involvement for CWS and Parks Canada. In addition, individual scientists serve on international committees and on secondment to international organizations such as IUCN and UNESCO. CWS's Latin American initiative and Parks' annual participation in the International Seminar on National Parks and Equivalent Reserves provide the major contribution to developing world conservation.

CUSO and WUSC traditionally operate in developing countries, but their mandates have generally inclined towards educational programs. In spite of that, those two organizations at present have 10 biologists in the field. Unfortunately, their budgets are frequently limited to volunteer conditions, restricting the scope of their project activities.

Non-governmental organizations in Canada, whose primary concern is conservation, show a surprising lack of interest in the developing world. A quick survey identified only the Canadian Wildlife Federation (CWF) and World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Canada as having projects in developing countries; and a third, the International Service for Environment and Development (ISED), has been recently established specifically to develop projects between Canadian environmental organizations and Third World countries.

The CWF is at present funding a couple of projects in developing countries, and co-hosted the "World conservation strategy" Conference in Ottawa this June. WWF Canada, as part of an international organization, contributes to selected projects of WWF International.

Experience of other donors

The world's leading organization for wildlife conservation is the IUCN in concert with the WWF. The latter financed 262 projects in 1985, and wildlife conservation is an integral aspect of the WCS.

UNDP and FAO have a variety of wildlife projects ranging from park identification and management to harvesting. US AID encompasses their wildlife programs within the broader context of their recently developed "Strategy on the conservation of biological diversity".

Discussions with staff from all the above organizations identified a number of common themes:

- the need for training;

- the requirement to develop the economic and social benefits of wildlife, and

- the need to integrate wildlife into resource development programs expounding a sustainable development philosophy.

Canadian capabilities in wildlife conservation

The Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference represents direct access, through the attending directors and administrators, to one of the largest bodies of wildlife management professionals in the world, second only to what may be found in the USA. However, closer examination reveals that few Canadian biologists have training or experience in tropical ecology or developing countries, thus limiting the effectiveness and influence of that cadre of skills in the conservation of the world's wildlife resources.

Canadian universities have taught wildlife management since the early 1950s, and although a number of them are at present active in overseas development programs, they seldom involve the participation of wildlife management faculties or student bodies. In addition, scant training is offered in tropical ecology.

It is against this background, and the constraints and priorities in host countries, that CIDA must consider its involvement in wildlife conservation in the Third World.

Conclusions and some proposals

From this rapid overview let me draw some conclusions and suggest some proposals to stimulate thinking.

(1) As a background, there is a growing awareness in CIDA of environmental and resource conservation needs, and an accompanying willingness to consider conservation initiatives.

(2) There is a need for training and educational programs in wildlife conservation in the Third World, and a corresponding need for Canadian biologists to gain experience in tropical ecosystems.

Looking at both sides of this issue, the workshop might consider a program of twinning provincial and federal wildlife departments with related departments in selected Third World countries.

Twinning could involved:

- exchange of administrative, professional and technical staff for on-the-job training--exchange staff could fill reciprocal positions, providing some degree of continuity while gaining valuable insights into the problems and operations of each organization;
- eventual identification and support for special projects--experience would soon identify small aspects of programs that the Canadian agency could finance through its own budget and other sources such as CIDA;
- the identification of summer-job or thesis opportunities for university students in both countries.

Twinning could provide a long-term active working relationship with at least 13 Third World wildlife agencies. The close co-operation would have numerous benefits, such as greater support for weak departments in the Third World, increased co-operation in implementing and administrating international conventions, more direct identification of development needs, and closer control over implementation and overseas experience for Canadian biologists. Twinning may be expanded to the departmental level, which frequently includes expertise in forestry and fisheries.

Initial exploratory discussions, in Canada and abroad, could be conducted by an NGO such as the ISED.

(3) The economic and social role of wildlife must be enhanced, especially its role as a traditional source of protein. However, there are few Canadian organizations or university wildlife faculties involved in supporting wildlife conservation in Third World countries.

This group could address the two issues by considering an "International wildlife management workshop" to be run for 1 or 2 weeks on an annual or biannual basis. The workshop may be sponsored by a university faculty in co-operation with the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference or an NGO, perhaps with assistance from CIDA.

The purpose of the workshops would be to offer administrative, professional and technical staff of wildlife departments, in Third World countries, the opportunity to meet and to examine in detail a variety of specific wildlife techniques and problems such as:

- population census methods,
- economic and social benefits of wildlife management,
- poaching control,
- habitat manipulation,
- assessing rare and endangered species populations,
- administrating international conventions (CITES, Ramsar),
- game-cropping and population management.

Travel to a number of venues in Canada and perhaps overseas could be part of the seminar, so that a variety of provincial agencies could host the meetings. It may eventually be expanded to include aspects of forestry and fishery management.

In conclusion, let me remind you that CIDA's method of operation is to react to requests and initiatives. If the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference is concerned about optimizing efforts in world wildlife conservation, the puck is in your end of the rink. The discussions here should indicate how far you are willing to skate with it.

(continued)

Summary of Workshop 1 report

R.J. Herring
Canadian Forestry Service
Rapporteur

The question for Workshop 1 was: "How do we optimize our efforts in world wildlife conservation through our export of technology and funds?". Ralph Roberts, with the assistance of Paul Dean, prepared the opening statement (preceding this report).

Mr. Roberts' suggestion, that the workshop group could address the issue of perhaps having international wildlife management workshops, led us to a discussion that focused on three main themes: the whole issue of training as a way of optimizing our resources available to developing countries; the environmental impact assessment of development projects; and the appropriateness of our level of funding for overseas projects. The recommendations that we then made to the Recommendations Committee reflect these themes.

In the discussion, it was thought that many project failures occurred because of low skill levels in developing countries, and that was why we centred on training to optimize resources and to ensure that the host country could carry on. It was thought that training in Canada might not be appropriate at colleges and universities because we simply could not transfer the technology that we were employing in Canada to developing countries. It might be more appropriate to finance wildlife schools in developing countries, such as Moika.

It was also thought that there was a need to focus our attention. Spreading ourselves too thinly across many countries and many issues was a difficulty and, again, it was believed that the twinning idea was a useful method of perhaps narrowing our interests and maximizing our opportunity to use resources. We discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the twinning process itself, and agreed that the process would have to be looked at in a fairly sophisticated way. It could involved NGOs.

Another point raised was a need for major multinationals to do their part in ensuring that their projects overseas were environmentally sound--that they did an appropriate job overseas. This led to the whole question of the environmental impact assessment of development projects abroad, and the fact that CIDA was in the process of developing an environmental assessment policy.

We talked about our expertise in developing the North. It was thought that the Indigenous Peoples International could be involved in providing some assistance in this whole area. Perhaps an interdisciplinary approach was needed; a sectoral approach might be impossible in some cases.

It was mentioned that we made a lot of mistakes and tended to perhaps export our mistakes, but we were very good at problem identification. Perhaps it was our problem identification technology that we might wish to export, especially since in some cases we just simply did not have the expertise, particularly in tropical ecosystems.

Recommendations

This discussion led to four recommendations, given here in brief:

- that the idea of twinning be endorsed, and that the process be encouraged with the assistance of CIDA to do so;
- that the conference endorse the development of an environmental assessment review process that is being developed by CIDA, and encourage other agencies and industries to also develop an appropriate environmental impact assessment policy; and that these policies should give appropriate attention to post-project evaluation;
- that the conference encourage, amongst its members, sponsorship of specialized workshops in developing countries; these workshops could be developed in co-operation with the universities or college faculties; and perhaps an NGO, and again perhaps with the assistance of CIDA;
- that a review might be done of the appropriateness of the level of funding now being provided by CIDA, for wildlife conservation projects, as a proportion of its total budget.

2. DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF CANADA'S PROGRAMS

Summary of Workshop 2 report

J. Inder
Parks, Recreation and Wildlife, Newfoundland
Rapporteur

Workshop 2 dealt with optimizing our efforts in world wildlife conservation through different perceptions of Canada's wildlife resources and management programs. We started out by saying a perception was not really a technocratic type of judgement. To the people who were doing the perceiving, it was a reality. We thought it would be useful to arrange these different perceptions in three categories: the good, the bad and the indifferent (where people did not really care one way or the other).

We listed several perceptions:

(1) Canada is making wise use of its wildlife. That was generally perceived by us to be a good perception by the public at large and the world.

(2) We make use of our wildlife; it does not just sit there. We felt that sometimes we were viewed negatively, and at other times positively, as to how or why we used wildlife.

(3) In Canada, there is an opportunity for all citizens to enjoy and/or use wildlife. Generally, that was perceived as being a good idea.

(4) Our national and provincial parks and our wildlife conservation areas that we set aside in Canada were generally looked on as a good system by the rest of the world.

(5) With regard to our control and accomplishments in acid rain, some felt that we were doing well, compared with what was at least reported going on in the United States, but that we somehow fell a little short of what was going on in Scandanavia and maybe other parts of Europe.

(6) There was a general feeling that our technical expertise in wildlife monitoring and censusing led to their being perceived as good programs.

(7) We know that a lot of the world perceives our use of wildlife as having cruel connotations. Of course, that was a negative thing; Rich Goulden had made a point at the beginning of our session about not dwelling too much on the negative, because we in wildlife tended to overdo that a little bit.

(8) Canadians can still earn a living from wildlife in Canada. Some people changed that around a bit and suggested that a lot of people outside Canada felt that we must make our living from wildlife in Canada because of our limited abilities in the more sophisticated ways of earning a living. We did not really think that held much water, or we did not want it to, so we preferred to think of just the original perception.

We then went on to changing perceptions of those whom we really wanted to influence, and we identified four categories of people:

(1) our peers in wildlife conservation in other countries,

(2) the political forces in those other countries,

(3) the general public, and

(4) the media.

Recommendations

We developed quite an extensive list of recommendations. Here they are given in no particular order of priority:

(1) The Canadian Wildlife Service should establish a clearing-house to disseminate information on good wildlife programs in Canada to the international arena. The criteria to be used to define "good programs" would be taken from the "World conservation strategy".

(2) The Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference should encourage universities and provincial and federal wildlife agencies to expand efforts in the exchange of wildlife personnel with other countries. This was something that Richard Herring touched on in terms of twinning. It goes on in other disciplines in Canada right now.

(3) All wildlife agencies in Canada should take advantage of opportunities in international meetings to promote our wildlife programs.

(4) We should improve the marketing of our wildlife programs by inviting the media, for instance, from other countries to come to Canada to view and discuss our programs.

(5) The Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference should make a point of having a media relations person on its Program Committee to promote the conference and the things that come out of it.

(6) Canadian Wildlife Service should establish an international unit to deal more effectively with international wildlife issues on a domestic basis.

(7) Provincial wildlife agencies should work closely with departments of education to incorporate wildlife management concepts into school curricula.

(8) The Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference should report annually on progress made in Canada on international wildlife conservation.

There is a tremendous need to establish or maybe re-establish the credibility of many of our programs within Canada. We can do this largely by providing more convincing factual information to our media. Also, we have to make an effort to neutralize some of our internal detractors.

3. MORE EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Summary of Workshop 3 report

J. Lord
Editor, Nature Canada
Rapporteur

We were asked to consider the question of how we could optimize our efforts in wildlife conservation through more effective current international agreements. On the Migratory Birds Convention, it was generally acknowledged that while it was imperfect, it was darned good. It was imperfect in the sense that there were anomalies in the writing thereof; blackbirds were left out, raptors were not listed, not enough countries were involved in the Convention. However, it was excellent in that it was solemnly binding; solemn binding of the parties involved was a highly unusual attribute in these days of less rigid agreements.

The very rigidity of the Migratory Birds Convention made it both excellent and highly dangerous to tamper with. One of the participants in the workshop said that we should guard it like the "Crown jewels". Another said that if we started tampering, we did not known what was going to arise from the ashes. But possibly the most interesting sidelight was what a Canadian Wildlife Service gentleman pointed out: that we could not very easily tamper with this act and try to make it perfect because it was a very old act and had not been modified since 1916, and was in fact an "Empire treaty". Empire treaties were eliminated from the Constitution many decades ago. There was no modifying mechanism in place. However, there was room to manoeuvre, we decided, by leaving the Convention intact but drafting effective protocols.

Therein lay our first recommendation. We recommend that efforts be accelerated to ratify the protocol and amend the Migratory Birds Convention so as to allow for a regulated hunt by subsistence users in Northern Canada and Alaska.

The second convention that was discussed was CITES. Major concerns centred on the need for structural and procedural changes. Various travesties were noted, some in fact dealing with the very thorny area of the choice of an effective chairperson for CITES meetings. We wanted to stress particularly the idea that issues must be dealt with intelligently and that the circus atmosphere that could emerge at such meetings must be avoided. When that occurred, lobbying could be more enthusiastic than the preparation had been.

Therefore, the recommendation that came out of this was: Whereas a number of deficiencies have been identified in the structures and procedures of CITES...we encourage CITES to pursue its efforts to make the necessary adjustments to its procedures and structures in order to make its meetings more effective and to guarantee an intelligent consideration of each issue. Furthermore, the CITES Secretariat is encouraged to take the necessary steps to make sure that initial proposals are sound and scientifically well researched.

The bright note here, as our chairperson indicated, is that Canada has an opportunity to set a good example in the next meeting. Those were the two major recommendations.

Other conventions

The rest of the discussion centred largely around Ramsar and newer conventions. All the committee felt that in comparison to the Migratory Birds Convention, the other conventions like Ramsar were rather toothless. That was not in any way to diminish their effectiveness. Since the designations, for example, in Ramsar were voluntary, and there was an opt-out clause, these sorts of agreements tended to be more readily established.

One participant from CWS cited the example of an agreement that was now in place and had been working effectively for 6 years; had the agreement been drafted more stringently, it would probably even now not be in place. It was felt that valid work was being done in these looser agreements (for example, the Latin American Program) and that there were great benefits to loosely structured agreements versus conventions. The agreements exerted a moral force, and they gave conservation communities something on which they could hang their efforts. There was a consensus that we should not limit ourselves to formal conventions, but look enthusiastically to taking small bites into big problems with more flexible agreements.

4. IDENTIFICATION OF NEW INTERNATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Summary of Workshop 4 Chairman's comments

H.K. Eidsvik
Parks Canada
Chairman, IUCN Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas

Some of you probably wonder why "Canada's role in world wildlife conservation" is on the agenda; others may wonder where the opportunities are. I understand that many of you are concerned that Canada has a negative image in the global conservation community. Some of you may find international conventions threatening and interfering with your own jurisdictions. Here CITES probably looms large.

No matter how we look at it, we live in a global village. Instant news brings instant expertise to bear on many issues. This was illustrated last year by the wolf cull in northern British Columbia, and the flooding and the related caribou kill in northern Quebec. To an extent, Canada's profile is not good. This is a reflection of Canada's whaling position, the harp seal hunt, the debate on leg-hold traps, and the images of cruelty to animals pushed in the public press by various animal rights groups.

However, in the international conservation community in which I am involved, I find Canadian expertise and commitment to be both welcome and respected. This is reflected in the "World conservation strategy", as well as in the "World charter for nature" and CITES.

There are advantages to involvement in international agreements, I need cite only three: the Migratory Birds Convention and the work of Ducks Unlimited illustrate the point, and the "North American waterfowl management plan" underlines it.

We have for many years provided world expertise in such diverse fields as polar bears, cranes, turtles, raptors and monk seals. Our contributions within CITES, World Heritage, and MAB are well recognized, as is our contribution to organizations such as IUCN, ICBP, DU, and WWF. In the membership of IUCN's Special Survival Commission, there are more than 40 Canadian wildlife scientists.

It is interesting to note, however, that internal support is based on individual commitment more than institutional structures. When we look at universities, NGOs or government departments, we always find one or two individuals providing critical linkages to international programs. These roles are not institutionalized.

Frankly, if we wish to be seen less as the exploiter and more as the sustained yield manager, we must become involved in the international programs when and where management positions are developed. Thus you, as wildlife managers, must institutionalize a commitment to international conservation. In straightforward terms, this means to commit people and financial resources. It may save you some misery in the future. It may even make your life easier and your contribution to wildlife management larger. The Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference has an opportunity to provide leadership.

Existing structures

But, before we take off in a new direction, are we doing well in providing leadership for our current activities? This is the subject of several other workshops. However, we should be alert to existing agreements:

> Migratory Birds Convention, Polar Bear Agreement, CITES, Ramsar, Migratory Species (Bonn), World Heritage, Man and the Biosphere, Western Hemisphere, International Whaling Convention, Law of the Sea, and "World charter for nature".

We should also be alert to existing organizations:

> North American Wildlife Conference, CCIUCN (Canadian Committee for IUCN), Ducks Unlimited, IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources), ICBP (International Committee for Bird Protection), IWRB (International Waterfowl Research Bureau), WWF (World Wildlife Fund), and CWF/CNF/NPPAC (Canadian Wildlife Federation/Canadian Nature Federation/National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada).

I am not trying to be exhaustive, but it is important to look at our existing organizations and structures and how they may achieve our purposes before we, the conference, launch off into new ventures. What is really important is to reinforce or adjust existing structures to achieve old objectives, before we try to create new structures to achieve old objectives. I am convinced that the structures exist. In this workshop our challenge is to find new ways to make them work.

In the past few months and weeks, we have had global opportunities to influence both Canada's impact on and Canada's involvement in the international scene through the following:

> House/Senate Committee on External Affairs, Brundtland Commission, "World conservation strategy" Conference, "Fate of the earth" meeting, IUCN Council meeting, ICBP meeting, and International Ornithological Congress.

Did we do our job? It really does not matter, because that is past. Did we really use the opportunities? This is important because if we did not, we are not organized.

Looking to the future we have two major meetings occurring in Canada during 1987: Ramsar at Regina and CITES at Ottawa. Are you organized and prepared to make these meetings useful for wildlife conservation in Canada? If you can do this you will open a window to the international world.

Are you, as conference participants, prepared to relate these national objectives to international concerns? If so, how do we integrate these objectives in the conference's future tasks?

Do we need a parallel to the American Committee for International Conservation (ACIC)? This is a non-governmental organization. Can we make an existing organization work to achieve this (CCIUCN), which is a mix of NGOs and governmental organizations? Or, as participants in the workshop, are we more concerned with getting ourselves more involved, getting our governments more involved, communicating more knowledge overseas, receiving more knowledge here, and sticking with the status quo?

Finally, I have four proposals for you to consider with respect to future directions.

Future directions for consideration

(1) The Canadian Committee for IUCN should be reactivated as a mechanism for:

- (a) maintaining liaison between Canadian members of IUCN and its international activities;
- (b) developing national positions on issues of concern to IUCN, and communicating them to the President and Director General;
- (c) nominating and supporting delegates to IUCN and other international meetings to represent the positions of the members of CCIUCN.

(2) Members of the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference should become "agency" members of IUCN, and designate an officer with responsibility to assist in its programs and monitor its activities.

(3) Members of the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference should request the conference secretariat to provide background on the conventions and initiatives of the international conservation community, so that they may consider their future role more readily.

(4) Members of the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference should suggest that their governments give serious consideration to sending at least two delegates or observers to:

- (a) the Regina meeting of the Parties to the Wetlands Convention,
- (b) the Ottawa meeting of the Parties to the CITES Convention.

If participants are of the view that we are all doing as much as we can, we should now move on to a discussion of in situ conservation and the preservation of biological diversity. However, if opportunities exist to reinforce present activities, let us concentrate on these in our workshop.

Summary of Workshop 4 report

J. Walker
British Columbia Wildlife Branch
Rapporteur

The theme of our workshop was: "How do we optimize our efforts in world wildlife conservation through the identification of new international opportunities?". Our job was made somewhat easier by the fact that our Chairman, Harold Eidsvik, had kindly put down some leading ideas on paper to start off the discussion. I should also mention that, when we talked about world wildlife conservation, we extended the term wildlife to include wildlife habitat as well. We were not only talking about wildlife populations.

Our group attempted to define why we thought we should be so concerned about world wildlife conservation. We basically came up with three reasons, beginning with the most altruistic:

(1) to sincerely assist developing-world countries in properly managing their wildlife resources;

(2) to improve our image internationally and to help counter some of the negative criticism we had received;

(3) to help promote the better acceptance of concepts such as legitimate use of wildlife on the international stage.

The first observation made by our group was the very obvious lack of interest in wildlife management by the media. If we were going to help to educate and inform the world, we had better start on our own doorstep. Only a single media representative was present at this entire conference, even with the very exciting and profound presentation by Mrs. Bata. We believed that we had to refine our efforts to inform people in Canada. Our efforts tended to be too academic and frequently to presume that we knew what people wanted, without really bothering to ask them. We did not even do much of a job in promoting the good things that we were doing.

Problem solving

How do we do a better job of optimizing our role in wildlife conservation? We did not believe the greatest benefit in future was necessarily through more formalized, extensive, multilateral agreements. Possibly we needed more of a one-on-one approach with some interested countries. We had to concentrate more on exporting training programs in wildlife conservation and begin to explore more fully ideas such as the exchange of students and the exchange of expertise. We concluded that, in the past, the expertise we had exported to other countries to assist them may have been too policy-orientated or, on the other hand, too basically technical. We needed to provide countries with problem-solving capability, not just individual expertise. We thought something along the lines of a "Wildlife Peace Corps" was what we had to aim at.

There had to be more of an attempt to relate benefits from wildlife to economic benefits. We also had to make an attempt, but diplomatically, to attach ecological "conditions" to our foreign aid programs, to give more weight to those that allowed the wildlife benefits to be developed in co-operation with a major project.

We also discussed the possibility of giving credit or relief on outstanding loans, if a project was related to wildlife, and the need to develop our own policy and procedures on international issues, instead to simply going along with the initiatives of others. We believed that this conference should lead the way in the development of these policies and positions, similar to the development of the national guidelines for wildlife policy, with CWS as the lead agency in the co-ordination of our national efforts, and with active co-operation from the provinces.

Finally, our group observed that there was a golden opportunity for Canada this year to demonstrate its interest in world-wide wildlife conservation at the World's Fair in Vancouver, where practically the whole world was at our door, but only one of the provinces and territories had taken the opportunity to do this--the Northwest Territories.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

K.A. Brynaert (Canadian Wildlife Federation) returned to the recommendation made by Jim Inder that new initiatives should be looked at to develop educational programs. His suggestion, based on his own earlier remarks, was that Wildlife Week was an excellent opportunity to implement that recommendation.

J. Inder (Newfoundland Parks, Recreation and Wildlife) replied that in Newfoundland, for instance, and he was sure in other provinces, they were really encouraging and making good progress in Project WILD as well, which dealt directly with the Department of Education.

Unidentified woman from the audience referred to a recommendation concerning environmental impact assessment in developing countries, and was happy to report that, in OECD, leading specialists in the developed world on environmental impact assessment had got together and designed guidelines specifically orientated towards developing countries' problems. So their recommendation might be just a little bit too late. The guidelines, she continued, would be presented to the environmental agencies in developing countries within a few months, and they would discuss, with experts in developed countries, how these could be applied.

R.J. Herring (Canadian Forestry Service) replied that their discussion related not so much to the existence of the guidelines, but their application by agencies who were either funding projects in developing countries by themselves or assisting industry in some way in funding their projects in developing countries.

H. Schwenk (Alberta Wildlife Advisory Council) said that two of the workshops had seemed to identify the media as being fairly key in this whole process. He wondered if there did not need to be a lot more work by someone in the coming years to harness the positive things that could come out of using the media for positive purposes. It was easy for media to get to the public on negative things because these seemed to get people's attention--got their emotions up--but the everyday ordinary thing that was really a benefit to societies around the world was not so easy to harness and get the positive things happening.

K.A. Brynaert made reference to last year's conference, where he thought they had come to recognize that attracting media attention was not something that happened accidentally, or by inviting the press to conferences. He had come to the realization that if they wanted to get their message out it would require professionalism, people who knew how to deal with the media. As an example, a recent conference that had representation from 83 countries had dealt with what he considered to be a very important subject, the "World conservation strategy". After five days of deliberations, there was not one single line in any newspaper, either locally, nationally or internationally; and the answer was simply that they had not done anything about it. Unfortunately, they did not have the funds to do it. They should recognize that if they wanted the press to take up their case, they had got to pay for it.

J. Walker (British Columbia Wildlife Branch) said that his people felt strongly that if they were going to get involved in international issues to any depth, people from External Affairs should be invited to these conferences on a continuing basis, and there should be some contact people identified for wildlife-related issues in External Affairs whom they could consistently liaise with.

H.A. Clarke (Canadian Wildlife Service) replied that they were invited and there were contact people within the Department of External Affairs.

B. des Clers (International Foundation for the Conservation of Game) thought that they should probably also invite CIDA.

D. Neave (Wildlife Habitat Canada) responded that, as far as he knew, CIDA had been invited for the first time this year.

R. Goulden (Manitoba Wildlife Branch) said that, in his workshop, there was a suggestion that if they really wanted to get serious about Canada's role internationally in wildlife conservation, then they had to know more about what they were doing now. The report by CWS laudably showed what their Service was doing internationally, but most of the provinces and NGOs did not highlight such items in their reports. It might be useful if they adopted, as a matter of practice, annual reporting at this conference on their stewardship internationally, showing how they were doing collectively. They could tell factually some of the things that they were doing and build upon those positive experiences.

J. Inder suggested to the Recommendations Committee that the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference report annually on any progress made by Canada in international wildlife conservation. Another point arising from his workshop, he said, was that each Canadian should act as a goodwill ambassador for Canadian wildlife management programs whenever and wherever the opportunity arose.

Conference summary

IMPRESSIONS OF THE PROCEEDINGS

P. O'Malley
President, O'Malley Communications

I presume that the conference organizers invited me to speak so that you might get a perspective from one whose professional expertise lies in the area of communication and media relations, and it is from that vantage point that I speak to you.

In summarizing my impressions of the conference proceedings, let me divide what I am going to say into two related matters for the purpose of analysis: one deals with matters institutional; the other area touches more upon, for want of another word, the substantive. I will attempt to address within each category what this conference said to me, both as a non-scientific layman and as a professional communicator, about Canada's international role in support of conservation.

The institutional

Much of the discussion of this conference was necessarily focused on the international institutions through which we, as a country, participate in conservation decision-making; institutions such as CITES, Ramsar, the WCS and the IUCN. As a citizen, one can only take pride in the role which our country has played in the development of these important international institutions. As a professional communicator, however, I have to ask why I, or the vast majority of other Canadians, do not know anything about our international concerns and achievements in this area.

A number of speakers have noted over the past few days that we have had, in Canada, a variety of important international events in recent weeks, such as the visit of the World Commission on Environment and Economic Development, the holding of the WCS Conference, the proclamation of UN World Environment Day, and now this conference.

Throughout all those events, the media table has sat almost entirely empty. Likewise, throughout this federal-provincial conference, the media table has been vacant. The question therefore arises as to whether anyone in Canada cares about the work of the institutions we have been hosting and discussing. Do they care about the issues being debated in these various fora? My answer to these question is a very emphatic "yes". Canadians do care about environment and conservation, and even about the international dimensions of conservation. There is plenty of public opinion in evidence to support this assertion.

You may recall that, last year, External Affairs had a set of public opinion polls done in Canada that were obtained by the media under the Access to Information Act. In this study, Canadians were asked to rank what they thought were the most important things that Canada should be doing internationally, and the issues they thought their government should most care about on a global basis.

The results were truly surprising, and from the standpoint of the conservation movement, also very encouraging. Hunger and famine-related issues were ranked first in importance for the average Canadian. The second area of concern was the war/peace "issue cluster". The straight economic issues which preoccupy our media and our politicians were ranked third.

Equally important, the average Canadian not only ranked hunger and famine issues as first in importance, but also felt that this was the area in which Canada had the most to contribute, and that our contribution should concentrate upon finding long-term solutions, not just quick-fix palliatives. In short, the poll showed that Canadians place a lot of importance on what you have been talking about for the last few days, and on what has been discussed over the past few weeks in the other fora we have hosted in Canada. And yet Canadians read, see and hear very little informed debate through their media about these matters.

The question I, as an outsider, want to ask of you as wildlife managers is whether the low level of public and media awareness about the actual issues of conservation and of wildlife management represent an impediment, if not a threat, to sound wildlife management. Again as a non-expert, I can only think that it does. Moreover, from what I have learned from a number of people here, and from what some of the previous speakers have talked about, it does not seem alarmist to say that there is a real and profound problem in the making: namely, much of what needs to be done in the future to manage wildlife properly may not happen, or not happen properly or quickly enough, if you do not start to get some messages out to the media and the public about what the real issues are, and about what wildlife management actually is all about.

On the simplest level, for example, it strikes me that culls are becoming very difficult, if not almost impossible, to do in Canada. If I were a wildlife manager who had determined that a particular species had to be reduced in number so as to restore some kind of balance for authentic conservation reasons, I think I would be most loath to proceed with a cull because of the opposition which it could engender. Or I might end up making it too late or later than I should because of my fear of the political consequences.

I think of the growing West-coast seal problem as an example, where political concerns seem to be overriding biological science. The potential East-coast seal problem and the danger it may pose to the Canadian fishery is another example. If it turns out that the biological evidence dictates that we should cull that herd, are we ready for what that means in terms of what we have to explain to the world? We had immense difficulty in justifying the image of the Newfoundlander standing on the ice with the club raised over the seal pup, and failed totally in convincing anyone of our case. How are we going to explain helicopter gun-ships or whatever is required to cull the herd in 5 years' time to save the fishery.

I also sense that even basic wildlife research is becoming more difficult to do because of lack of media and public awareness of what it is all about. I noted an item in the newspaper the other day that the Canadian Wildlife Service has put 50 ducks around Walpole Island to find out over the course of the summer what the effect of pollution is on waterfowl. In the fall, CWS plans to take those ducks out and dissect them to determine what level of pollutants they have absorbed. Would anyone want to put money on whether CWS will actually be able to complete this study? Should an animal rights group seize the issue and decide to campaign in the media on it, the smart money would bet on the animal righters winning the day.

The point I want to make is that people do actually care about the things that you care about, but no one is following what you have to say, or knows much about the real issues involved in wildlife management. The end result is that it may become increasingly more difficult for you to do what needs to be done if wildlife is to be properly managed. There is a remedy here which I will return to a little later.

The substantive

Let me now turn to the second analytical category that I heard talked about over the last few days: namely, the state of Canada's overall international image on wildlife matters, and what our role should be in the world of international conservation. This subject was very much the focus of the previous session and of the CITES panel.

I first should say that I agree with Dr. Munro that any country, any product, any person for that matter, projects a range of different images. I would only add, however, that there can often be a single image which dominates. Further, I think that there is a dominant Canadian image in the area of treatment of wildlife: it is the image of a man standing on an ice floe with a club raised above his head ready to bash in a baby seal's skull.

As uncomfortable as we may be with that image, and as unfair as it may seem to us, I think we have to be honest with ourselves and admit that in the area of wildlife management, Canada's international image is most likely dreadful. I say "most likely" because no one has ever actually tested international public opinion in this area. However, conversations and research internationally done by my firm strongly suggest that this is the case.

One is also drawn to this conclusion by an examination of the basic marketing strategies of the international animal rights movement itself, some elements of which have done opinion and attitudinal research. If you look at how they sell their messages to the media and the public in Western Europe and the USA, it becomes clear that they think they have a vested interest in consistently portraying Canada as barbaric in its treatment of wildlife. I see no reason to dispute their belief.

It is not accidental, for example, that flowing quite naturally out of the seal hunt protest, which was a financial bonanza for most of the major animal rights organizations, we have the broader anti-fur movement. Nor is it accidental that one of the main targets of the anti-fur movement is the Canadian trapper, or that one of the major films used worldwide against trapping is titled "Canada's shame".

The fact is that large amounts of money have been spent and continue to be spent by the animal rights movement to perpetrate a negative image of Canada. In doing so they are simply building on the already established negative image they have built for us around the seal hunt. Why go to the expense of establishing a new villain when the old one will do?

In response to these efforts, the Canadian public and private sectors combined are spending what can only be called an insignificant amount of time and money dealing with our critics. Related to this failure on our part as a country to commit ourselves to a serious effort at countering the negative messages of our detractors, I have noted over the past few days that most of our thinking on this seems to centre on communication at the meetings of the various international institutions, such as CITES. What disturbs me about this is that we are not as attuned to thinking about how we can get our messages about Canada's real concerns and successes in conservation beyond these meeting rooms, and out to the world public.

If we were to do so, what would be Canada's "unique selling proposition", as the marketers would call it? During the conference, a number of ideas were fleshed out and a number of thoughts were raised about how it is that we are special, and what we can say as a country that is unique and that will improve the image of this country in terms of our environmental and wildlife concerns. One set of ideas talked about was strengthening our role within the various institutions, and one can only support that. But I do get the sense, as I noted earlier, that we have already done a great deal in this area; that our NGOs are highly active within CITES; that our government is no pushover; that we do care about these things and follow them; that we have had a very strong leadership role in the founding of and development of the user-NGO coalition.

Positive image

There are two characteristics or aspects of our country which I did not hear very much about, but which it seems to me provide a foundation for building a special and positive conservation image internationally.

First and foremost is the aboriginal dimension of our country, and the relationship that aboriginals play, not just in our present wildlife management regime, but in that which is about to occur. For reasons that I know I do not have to explain to a lot of you--reasons to do with the new constitution, the courts, and with land claims activity--the reality is that we are moving towards an institutionalized system of co-managed wildlife resources between aboriginal and non-aboriginal people. Indeed, although the state and the public authority will maintain the ultimate jurisdictional authority over resources, there is no doubt that we are in a position where legal and political reality points to co-management of our wildlife resources in large, and important, areas of this country.

From a communication perspective, this gives us an opportunity worldwide to emphasize something which is unique and positive about this country, and which I think gets to the heart of the user's message: that there is a harmony between use and conservation, that harvesting is a legitimate part of wildlife management, and that wildlife does need to be managed. I think these elements of a positive international conservation message can be well articulated in communication by and about the relationship of aboriginal people to the land.

The second area where I think we have, if not a uniqueness we can project, at least a special quality, relates to the fact that we are an arctic nation, even an arctic power. When one stands at the pole on this planet and looks around, one observes that approximately one-third of the polar land mass is Canadian. I think that basic fact is a significant plus in selling a positive set of messages about this country, about our wildlife management and about how we care about the environment. The whole notion of Canada as an arctic power has been buried for the last 20 or 30 years, for reasons which I do not know, but I would say that the basic arctic dimension would be another key element in repositioning Canada internationally in terms of conservation matters.

If our international image is to be strengthened, if Canada is to reposition itself from being the home of the seal clubbers to a place that the world public associates with responsible use of wildlife, then you must make some decisions. The first decision has to be to agree in principle that we have a very serious image problem internationally, and that this problem represents and presents a major limitation on our international effectiveness within the international conservation movement.

Once you have bought that notion, the question then becomes what, if anything, do you do to rebuild, or reposition, Canada's image. In this regard, my suggestion is that those of you responsible for managing wildlife in this country and for our international efforts should first realize that the image problem is solvable, but that you do not have the tools with which to work. For wildlife managers to sit down and design a communication program to "re-image" Canada would be like asking me to sit down and develop, design and implement a wildlife management scheme. It makes about the same amount of sense.

The main point I am trying to make, and forgive my bluntness, is that you have to spend money on communication. It was not accidental that there was no media coverage of the "World conservation strategy" Conference. There was no money budgeted for communication. It is not accidental that the press table here has sat empty. There is no budget for media efforts. Frankly, if you look at most things that wildlife management people are responsible for, the communication budget is usually zero. Accordingly, the effectiveness in communication is usually nil or close to nil.

Managing the debate

Standing back from the situation facing wildlife managers, one senses that what is happening here is similar in some respect to what has occurred in the fitness movement in North America in the last 10-15 years. The fitness movement, as we all know, has profoundly affected some of our basic social attitudes and activities. But the fact is that the medical establishment missed it. That establishment, which had successfully portrayed themselves as the stewards of our health, played no role of any importance in the whole fitness movement. As a result, that profession has lost a lot of the respect and influence it once had as the keeper of our health.

One wonders if the same thing is happening in the environmental area. There is a growing public awareness and concern about environmental matters. This may even be in part an extension of the fitness movement (i.e., if I've got my body fit to live on this planet, then you guys can damn well get the planet fit for my body to live on).

The issue here is whether the established conservation movement, and those who are responsible for wildlife management in our society, wish to influence and focus the debate on wildlife management issues, or will they give this up to others--namely, animal righters who do want to seize that debate. Should the animal righters successfully manage the debate, wildlife authorities may end up having to respond to people who know very little about what it is that you do for a living, and about the important issues involved in wildlife management, and who insist upon political quick fixes and other sorts of things that sound good to them but not to you.

In consequence, you may end up operating programs that from your standpoint are inane at best, and from a conservation standpoint may end up being truly counter-productive. In short, you may lose control of the situation.

In order to avoid that, one can only support the reports from a number of workshops which urged that we concern ourselves with our international image, and begin to look at the communication vehicles needed to solve our image problems. In short, my suggestion is that wildlife managers no longer view communication as an add-on frill, something to be done if the funds are left over for it. If communication efforts are not given higher priority by wildlife managers and conservationists, then you will lose control of the issues and debates around wildlife management, and real wildlife management programs will increasingly become impossible to do because of negative public opinion.

Reports

ANNUAL HIGHLIGHT REPORTS

Highlight reports were received from nine provinces and the Northwest Territories. Nova Scotia and the Yukon Territory did not submit reports to the conference. The Canadian Wildlife Service and several non-governmental organizations provided reports as well. Due to limited space, these reports are not included in these transactions. Copies of reports can be obtained by writing to the following addresses:

Provincial/territorial wildlife agencies

Alberta

Fish and Wildlife Division
Department of Energy
  and Natural Resources
Government of Alberta
Petroleum Plaza, North Tower
9945 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2C9

British Columbia

Wildlife Branch
Ministry of Environment
Government of British Columbia
Parliament Building
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X5

Manitoba

Wildlife Branch
Department of Natural Resources
Government of Manitoba
PO Box 24
1495 St. James Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3H 0W9

New Brunswick

Fish and Wildlife Branch
Department of Forests, Mines and Energy
Government of New Brunswick
PO Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

Newfoundland

Wildlife Division
Department of Culture,
  Recreation and Youth
Government of Newfoundland
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Northwest Territories

Wildlife Management Division
Government of the
  Northwest Territories
PO Box 1320
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

Ontario

Wildlife Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources
Government of Ontario
Whitney Block
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1W3

Prince Edward Island

Fish and Wildlife Unit
Department of Community and Cultural Affairs
Government of Prince Edward Island
Jones Building
11 Kent Street,
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8

Québec

Direction général de la faune
Ministère du loisir, de la
chasse, de la pêche et
du tourisme
Gouvernement du Québec
150, boulevard Saint-Cyrille est
Québec (Québec)
G1R 4Y3

Saskatchewan

Wildlife Branch
Department of Parks and
Renewable Resources
Government of Saskatchewan
3211 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 5W6

Federal wildlife agency

Canadian Wildlife Service

Scientific and Technical Communications
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario.
K1A 0E7

Non-governmental agencies

Canadian Federation of Humane Societies

101 Champagne Avenue, South
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 4P3

Canadian Nature Federation

Suite 203
75 Albert Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6G1

Canadian Wildlife Federation

1673 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 3Z1

Ducks Unlimited Canada

1190 Waverley Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2E2

Fur Institute of Canada

Suite 205
PO Box 29
60 Bloor Street, West
Toronto, Ontario
M4W 3B8

Wildlife Habitat Canada

Suite 301
1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 1C7

Wildlife Society of Canada

c/o Scott Jones
Acting President
Wildlife Society of Canada
Ministry of Natural Resources
322 Kent Street, West,
Lindsay, Ontario
K9V 4T7

World Wildlife Fund Canada

Suite 201
60 St. Clair Avenue, East
Toronto, Ontario
M4T 1N5

Report (highlights)

STATUS OF WATERFOWL, JUNE 1986

Migratory Birds Branch
Canadian Wildlife Service

Summary of duck breeding conditions

Atlantic Region

Over the past 20 years, while the hybrid zone between Black Duck and Mallard moved east, and Black Duck numbers dropped in Ontario and Quebec, the Atlantic Region Black Ducks held their own. New results from breeding-pair surveys and from the Breeding Bird Survey now indicate a slight decrease in Atlantic Black Ducks over the past few years. It is too early to tell whether this is a trend that will persist, or whether it is natural long-term cycling.

Population monitoring programs in the Atlantic Region are not geared to predictions of duck production as early as June. Water conditions are good this year and there have been no major weather problems to endangered nests or broods. Duck production should be normal, therefore. In particular, early observations of Black Duck pairs seem adequate to support a normal production of this species in 1986.

Quebec Region

Breeding conditions for Black Duck seem excellent. An early spring, about 2 weeks ahead of usual, led to early nest initiation. Conditions are favourable to high nest success rates.

In the north of Quebec, water levels are higher than usual. In the south, the early runoff led to some flooding early in May, which may have caused some losses, especially in the non-tidal portions of the St. Lawrence.

For most ducks in Quebec, reproductive success should match the good levels experienced in 1985.

Ontario Region

In northern Ontario, breeding conditions are fair this year. It was dry at the beginning of spring and there were some forest fires. The numbers of returning breeders were average.

In southern Ontario, conditions for production are excellent. Production there will be good, although the amount of remaining duck habitat is small.

In eastern Ontario, spring conditions were very dry. As a result, the number of breeding pairs is reduced. Late spring rains brought much higher water levels, so some areas should experience good brood production, although from a limited number of breeders.

Prairie Region

The prognosis for waterfowl production in the prairies varies from east to west, with fair prospects in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, dropping to poor prospects caused by very low numbers of breeders in southern Alberta. Except for southern Alberta, water levels had improved over what they were in the first half of the decade. There was rain and snow in much of the region this spring, so that there is hope of good brood success even from those areas where overall populations are low.

Pacific Region

Early warm weather in the spring was followed by cold. This may lead to decreased production of ducks in some of British Columbia.

Summary of breeding conditions for geese

Complete information for northern nesting goose populations is not yet available. Nesting is under way for Canada Geese around Hudson Bay, and a normal production of young should result. Canada Goose populations are generally thriving.

As for Snow Geese, both Lessers and Greaters, and for eastern Brant, it is a different story. A late arctic spring will mean limited production of these birds this year. At Frobisher Bay, snow-melt is at least 2 weeks late. At Cape Dorset, the Lesser Snow Geese are stalled in their northward movement by bad weather. It is still winter at Pond Inlet. Nesting of Greater Snow Geese will be late, or it may not take place.

In the western Arctic, nesting of Brant and Lesser Snow Geese will be delayed by cold weather.

Local Canada Goose populations in southern Canada continue to expand, with excellent prospects in Ontario, British Columbia and Quebec.

Last year's hunting permit sales

Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit sales declined in 1985-86, continuing the downward trend that started in 1979. With 1985 came the first year of the Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp, which amounted to a $4 increase in the permit cost to provide funds for Habitat Canada. The total permit sales, by zone within province, are shown in Table 1.

(continued)

Table 1: Hunting permit sales

Province/ Territory	Zone	1983	1984	1985
Nfld.	01	28 335	28 607	23 137
	02	2 642	2 702	2 515
PEI		5 898	5 525	5 171
NS	01	9 064	8 569	7 317
	02	4 404	4 327	3 432
NB	01	8 621	7 745	7 096
	02	4 137	3 741	3 258
Que.	01	52 859	50 980	47 672
	02	14 841	14 328	13 151
Ont.	01	38 194	38 796	36 457
	02	76 001	75 919	69 362
	03	25 374	25 806	24 270
Man.	01	33 304	28 850	26 322
	02	7 139	6 388	5 431
Sask.	01	17 854	14 658	14 734
	02	8 251	7 440	6 663
	03	19 278	15 622	15 048
Alta.	01	25 927	19 447	18 454
	02	35 815	32 270	26 426
BC	01	10 711	9 269	7 880
	02	13 459	12 623	10 873
NWT		750	850	713
Yukon		474	496	361
Total		443 332	414 958	375 743

Prairie regional waterfowl survey results

Table 2 shows some highlights of on-going co-operative waterfowl surveys.

Table 2: Mallard breeding populations in Canadian and US Prairies, 1982-86

Area	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
S. Alberta	766	846	607	803	717
S. Saskatchewan	2377	2067	1722	1333	1599
S. Manitoba	752	650	371	226	394
Cdn. Prairies	3895	3563	2700	2362	2710
Montana	324	230	189	152	157
N. Dakota	466	399	549	361	488
S. Dakota	292	415	334	310	532
US Prairies	1082	1044	1072	823	1177
Total	4977	4607	3772	3185	3887

Those readers who are not familiar with the stratum designation from the "Co-operative breeding group surveys" should be aware that the above-mentioned results cover all of the surveyed area except for the most northern parts, from which results are not yet available.

These results are preliminary and, for some strata, the information was not yet available.

Recent counts of Black Ducks and other surveys

The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) co-ordinates surveys of wintering waterfowl each January. These numbers of Black Ducks seen at mid-winter in recent years appear in Table 3.

Table 3: Black Ducks

1979 - 264 200
1980 - 221 000
1981 - 301 400
1982 - 217 600
1983 - 170 200
1984 - 165 700
1985 - 145 900
1986 - not available at this time

Table 4 shows a comparison of the kill for three major waterfowl species hunted in 1984 and 1985, including the Black Duck.

Table 4: Kills of major waterfowl species, 1984 and 1985

Province/ Territory	Mallard		Black Duck		Canada Goose	
	1984	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985
Nfld.	811	782	26 760	28 878	13 584	10 550
PEI	747	1 282	23 189	18 692	13 331	15 310
NS	2 061	3 226	51 573	43 983	6 900	6 936
NB	1 628	3 280	33 391	32 835	3 090	3 387
Que/	66 849	97 157	107 624	110 541	24 220	27 003
Ont.	283 624	290 463	64 390	64 748	63 859	71 640
Man.	118 071	84 455	350	474	93 292	105 912
Sask.	181 682	158 428	-	179	93 641	97 901
Alta.	304 785	180 870	517	-	98 753	94 756
BC	89 916	81 816	-	-	15 849	18 323
NWT	7 516	5 816	-	-	-	500
Yukon	1 681	1 168		-	379	205
Total	1 059 371	908 749	307 794	300 330	369 428	425 429

The results of the national surveys of the migratory game bird harvest in 1985-86 are now available. Table 5 is a breakdown of harvest by provinces.

Table 5: Migratory game bird harvest, 1985-86

Province/ Territory	Ducks	Total geese	Snipe	Woodcock
Nfld.	110 687	11 315	10 457	290
PEI	31 078	15 343	390	-
NS	92 300	6 961	1 774	3 364
NB	69 577	4 297	4 555	7 170
Que.	494 931	54 946	21 791	30 094
Ont.	871 549	80 728	7 716	49 456
Man.	174 489	207 399	2 498	-
Sask.	210 919	165 648	810	-
Alta.	282 779	128 105	2 804	-
BC	145 398	23 553	1 182	-
NWT	15 510	923	931	-
Yukon	2 973	213	63	-
Total	2 502 190	699 427	54 971	90 374

Report (program highlights)

COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF ENDANGERED WILDLIFE IN CANADA

J.A. Keith
Chairperson

This is the ninth report of the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) to the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference. COSEWIC is mandated by this conference to determine the status in Canada of wild species whose future may be in doubt, and to release the information upon which the declaration of status is based.

Classification actions

COSEWIC, in its prime role, assigned status to 25 species and populations on 8 April 1986. One additional species was withdrawn from consideration pending expected new information. Committee decisions, based on status reports and agreed status definitions, were as follows:

Rare:
- Prairie white fringed orchid
- Hill's pondweed
- Few-flowered club rush
- Climbing prairie rose
- Lake lamprey
- Fowler's toad

Threatened:
- Newfoundland marten
- Sweet pepperbush
- Roseate Tern
- Loggerhead Shrike

Endangered:
- Eastern mountain avens
- Hoary mountain mint
- Large whorled pogonia
- Slender bush clover
- Sea otter
- Bowhead whale (western Arctic population)
- Salish sucker
- Spotted Owl

Not in any category: (status reports were reviewed and the species were determined not to be rare, threatened, endangered, extirpated or extinct)

- Polar bear
- Narwhal
- Hooded seal
- Northern elephant seal
- Lake sturgeon
- Sharp-shinned hawk
- Eastern Screech Owl

Withdrawn/deferred (pending expected new information)

Vancouver Island marmot

Table 1: COSEWIC actions as of April 1986

(classed by major biological groupings and status)

Category (status)	Birds	Mammals (terrestrial)	Mammals (marine)	Fish	Plants	Amphibians & reptiles	Total
Rare	16	6	1	17	10	1	51
Threatened	8	4	1	1	10	-	24
Endangered	7	4	5	3	14	1	34
Extirpated	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
Extinct	3	2	-	2	-	-	7
Not in any category	9	8	4	2	1	-	24
Total	43	26	11	25	35	2	142

Other COSEWIC highlights

(1) An "Organization and procedures manual", under preparation and revision for some time, as called for by the membership, was adopted at the annual meeting. It is identified as the "First edition", and can be amended if necessary by a vote of the membership.

(2) COSEWIC notes with gratitude the high productivity of the Plants Sub-committee under its Chairperson, Dr. Erich Haber of the National Museum of Natural Sciences, Botany Division. The Plants Sub-committee has by far the largest number of species (approximately 3300) to deal with of any of COSEWIC's sub-committees, and it also contends with the largest number of species likely to be found at risk. Erich and his sub-committee have earned our congratulations.

(3) In view of the improving fortunes of some species (such as wood bison, Vancouver Island marmot and sea otter), members have called for agreed criteria to "down-list" or "de-list" species when there is sufficient justification to do so. Work is under way to develop appropriate criteria.

Summary of discussion

L. Lemieux (Diomedia Consultants) asked what the link was between the list of Canadian species designated as rare, threatened, etc., prepared by COSEWIC, and the list for the same purpose used by CITES, as far as it concerned Canada. Did CITES refer to COSEWIC to get its information? There were discrepancies that he found interesting.

J.A. Keith (Canadian Wildlife Service) replied that the COSEWIC list was generated separately form the CITES list. The two sources of the lists were quite separate. The CITES reports were prepared for species that might be in trade and be involved in a CITES list. The COSEWIC reports had nothing to do with trade as such. They were generated simply in Canada in terms of those species that were considered to be at some risk. COSEWIC was now attempting to work very closely with the CITES people to make sure that they did not duplicate unnecessarily, but the two lists were not the same.

L. Lemieux said that, on the basis of what Tony Keith had told them, he would have assumed that COSEWIC's list would be more extensive than that put together by CITES. He thought, however, that the reverse had happened and he found it somewhat curious.

J.A. Keith explained that the COSEWIC list was as long as the amount of energy that was put into producing it. It was not intended at that point to be exhaustive. In some cases the CITES list put in blocks of species, for example all owls. COSEWIC had not done that, so it was quite reasonable that the CITES list might appear to be longer, in some cases, than the COSEWIC one.

B. des Clers (International Foundation for the Conservation of Game) thought that it might be appropriate for COSEWIC to transmit its data to CITES, and made a suggestion to CITES that the Appendices be reviewed in view of Canadian data.

Report (program highlights)

POLAR BEAR ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE (PBAC)

I. Stirling, Canadian Wildlife Service
and K. Lloyd, NWT Wildlife Management Division

The 1986 meeting of the PBAC was held on 15 June. No representative from Quebec was present. Kevin Lloyd was elected as Chairman for a 2-year term.

A wide range of management and research problems were dealt with. Of particular interest are the following:

- the experimental drug Telazol, which has been field-tested and found to be particularly good for polar bears, is now commercially available from the United States;
- research on deterrents is continuing and a projectile that can be fired from a 12-gauge shutgun looks particularly promising;
- Northwest Territories will host a conference in Yellowknife in April 1987 on people-bear conflicts;
- the polar bear has been classified as "Not in any category" (NIAC) by COSEWIC;
- the need to continue to monitor the deposition of toxic chemicals and heavy metals in polar bear tissues was agreed to.

The quotas for polar bears in all the management zones were discussed. It was noted that the Inuit of eastern Baffin Island had voluntarily agreed to reduce their quota from 97 to 55 for 7 years because of concern about the possibility of over-harvest. This is a landmark in the management of polar bears in Canada because it is the first time a quota has been reduced. It also demonstrates the growing ability of users and managers to work together for the management of this species.

Other jurisdictions

Discussions between the Canadian and Alaskan Inuit to develop a users' agreement on quotas and management of polar bears in the Beaufort Sea began during the last year and are continuing.

The PBAC expressed overall support for the recommendations of the IUCN Polar Bear Specialists Group meeting held in 1985. In particular, the IUCN group emphasized the need to ensure co-operation in the management of internationally shared populations and protection of female polar bears with cubs and bears in dens throughout the range of the species. A letter will be sent to the IUCN with the Canadian responses to issues raised.

The proposed agreement on population research on polar bears in Foxe Basin and Hudson Bay was dropped because some jurisdictions still felt unable to participate, and because the research agreed to by others was already under way. Concern was expressed about the continuing lack of co-ordination in the management of the polar bear populations which may be shared by the Inuit of northern Quebec, Northwest Territories, Manitoba and Ontario.

The PBAC is developing a set of guidelines for sharing the available harvest between jurisdictions that share populations of polar bears.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 50TH FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

Recommendation No. 1 (Appreciation for hospitality)

That the conference express its appreciation to the Government of Canada, and to the Hon. Tom McMillan, Geneviève Sainte-Marie, Tony Clarke, Doug Pollock and other staff of the Canadian Wildlife Service, for the excellent arrangements and fine hospitality extended to the delegates of the 50th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Recommendation No. 2 (Thanks for reception and barbecue)

That the conference express its appreciation to Environment Canada and the Canadian Wildlife Service for the reception on the eve of the 50th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, and for the barbecue on 18 June.

Recommendation No. 3 (Thanks for breakfast)

That the conference express its appreciation to Ducks Unlimited Canada for hosting a breakfast on 18 June for delegates to the 50th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Recommendation No. 4 (Thanks for banquet)

That the conference express its appreciation to the Ministers of Renewable Resources of Yukon and the Northwest Territories for hosting the banquet on 19 June, and to Senator Bélisle for providing the Senate dining room.

Recommendation No. 5 (Appreciation to non-governmental organizations)

That the conference express its appreciation to participants from non-governmental organizations for their contributions to the success of the 50th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

Recommendation No. 6 ("World conservation strategy" Conference)

Whereas the "World conservation strategy" Conference, held in Ottawa from 31 May to 5 June 1986, has reiterated the importance of national and sub-national conservation strategies in ensuring the conservation and sustainable development of natural resources such as wildlife, soil and water, and

whereas Canada, in 1981, adopted the "World conservation strategy", and various provinces and territories are currently involved in the preparation of provincial and territorial strategies,

therefore it is recommended that the federal, provincial and territorial governments, with the assistance of interested non-governmental organizations, prepare, on a co-operative basis a Canadian conservation strategy that will integrate federal as well as provincial and territorial strategies in a single comprehensive document that encourages the integrated management of natural resources.

Recommendation No. 7 (Wildlife '87)

Whereas non-governmental wildlife organizations are desirous of dedicating a special year to wildlife conservation in Canada, and

whereas 1987 is a particularly appropriate year to highlight wildlife conservation in that the 6th CITES Conference, the Ramsar Convention Conference and the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference are being held in Canada, and

whereas 1987 marks the centennial of the establishment of Last Mountain Lake Migratory Bird Sanctuary in Saskatchewan, the oldest sanctuary in the Western Hemisphere, and

whereas federal, provincial and territorial wildlife agencies, through their respective ministers, have endorsed in principle the concept of proclaiming 1987 as a special year for wildlife,

therefore it is recommended that the 50th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference officially recognize 1987 as a special year for wildlife conservation in Canada to be known as "Wildlife '87", that the conference lend its support to the celebration of "Wildlife '87", and that the Program Committee for the 51st conference consider the theme "Wildlife '87, Gaining momentum".

Recommendation No. 8 (Wildlife damage control)

Whereas some populations of wildlife for which there is strong public demand can be depleted to unacceptable levels due to the action of predators, and

whereas wildlife-caused damage to agricultural crops and private property may cause economic hardship,

therefore it is recommended that control of predators and problem wildlife be conducted according to the following statement:

> Consensus statement on the control of wildlife that causes damage
>
> It is recognized that provinces and territories may have different objectives in the management of wildlife and that each jurisdiction is committed to the principle of the scientific management of all species to meet these diverse objectives. It is acknowledged that some species have the potential to adversely affect human safety, property and management objectives for other species. Where it is thought appropriate that such species be controlled, The Wildlife Society's "Policy on wildlife damage control" will be used as a general guideline, recognizing that local conditions will dictate the details of its implementation.
>
> The Wildlife Society's "Policy on wildlife damage control"
>
> The policy of The Wildlife Society, as regards control of animal damage, is to:
>
> (1) support only those animal control programs that are justified biologically, socially and economically;
>
> (2) encourage continuing research designed to improve methods of:

(a) accurately assessing the damage caused by wildlife,

(b) controlling and preventing animal damage, especially by non-toxic means, and

(c) measuring the effectiveness of damage control programs;

(3) recommend that efforts of control be the minimum required to bring damage within tolerable limits;

(4) support the use of only the most efficient, safe, economical, and humane methods to control depredating animals, and advocate effective lethal control only when other methods are unsatisfactory;

(5) urge that all control programs directed at wildlife populations and species be regulated closely by provincial, territorial or federal laws.

Recommendation No. 9 (Hunting and trapping)

Whereas hunting and trapping are regarded by wildlife management agencies as legitimate and desirable uses of wildlife, and

whereas wildlife management agencies perceive the need for a statement of government support for hunting and trapping,

therefore it is recommended that the following statement on hunting and trapping be endorsed by each provincial, territorial and federal wildlife agency:

Consensus statement on hunting and trapping as desirable uses of wildlife

Consistent with the "World conservation strategy", the primary goal of wildlife management in Canada is to maintain the natural diversity and abundance of wildlife over its traditional range. Secondary objectives are to provide wildlife in sufficient abundance to meet the aesthetic, cultural, recreational and economic needs of society, and to manage wildlife populations at levels which are compatible with other resource and community interests. Due to this wide variety of uses of wildlife and the demands of other land and water users, most wildlife populations must be actively managed in order to sustain and, where appropriate, increase their numbers through enhancement and regulation of use. As part of this management strategy, hunting and trapping are recognized as pursuits which are deeply rooted in Canada's outdoor heritage and culture, and are honourably tied to our history and evolution. Moreover, hunting and trapping can generate an appreciation and understanding of natural environments, characteristics which are seen as desirable elements of the Canadian identity.

These activities will be managed so that they will not endanger the ecological well-being of animal populations, and where methods and practices are employed that reflect respect and dignity for the animal. The interests, feelings and opinions of non-hunters and non-trappers will be considered in managing hunting and trapping.

The federal, provincial and territorial governments, with due regard to the humane and ethical considerations outlined, are fully committed to the perpetuation of hunting and trapping and to the protection of the opportunity of Canadians to pursue these activities.

Recommendation No. 10 (CITES)

Whereas Canada will be hosting the next meeting of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species in Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) in July 1987 in Ottawa, and

whereas the occasion provides a unique opportunity for Canadians to demonstrate to CITES delegates from other nations the richness of Canada's wildlife resources, the beauty and extent of our nation and the unity of its people,

therefore it is recommended that the provinces, territories and federal government and interested NGOs begin immediately to support the Activities and Special Events Committee in providing educational demonstrations and materials emphasizing the distribution, abundance and wise use of our wildlife resources, and

the Canadian delegation to CITES be selected immediately so that it might be adequately prepared to deal with the issues in a unified and informed fashion.

Recommendation No. 11 (International Symposium on Agriculture and Wildlife)

Whereas strategies are needed to involve the agricultural community in achieving the objectives of the "North American waterfowl management plan" (NAWMP), and

whereas the general dependence of wildlife on agricultural land and the practices used thereon is a crucial and on-going concern of wildlife managers,

therefore it is recommended that an International Symposium on Agriculture and Wildlife be held in 1989 or earlier, and that one of its sessions be aimed at addressing the particular needs under the NAWMP, and that a three-person committee report to the 51st Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference with recommendations for location, outline of theme, expansion, timing, etc. for further direction from this conference.

Recommendation No. 12 (Wildlife Colloquium)

Whereas a Colloquium of Wildlife Ministers was held in Ottawa on 6-8 May 1986 to discuss innovative ways of funding and developing new approaches to wildlife management, and

whereas the Ministers directed that they receive a report developing the many ideas put forward at that conference,

therefore it is recommended that the conference accept the verbal report on the Colloquium submitted by Dr. David Munro and recommend that a task force be set up to oversee and co-ordinate further consideration of the findings of the Colloquium, and that the task force report to the Ministers within one year.

Recommendation No. 13 (Commendation to Saskatchewan)

Whereas the "North American waterfowl management plan" (NAWMP) will significantly enhance soil and water conservation, along with waterfowl and other wetland wildlife production, and whereas Canada has signed the NAWMP, and

whereas Saskatchewan has taken a bold and forward step in committing resources towards implementation of the plan in that province,

therefore it is recommended that Saskatchewan be commended for its initiative, and that other provinces, territories and federal jurisdictions similarly take prompt action to implement the plan in their areas or sectors of responsibility.

Recommendation No. 14 (Ramsar Conference)

Whereas the well-being of Canada's waterfowl resources is dependent on wetlands in other nations, and

whereas the protection and conservation of wetlands is essential to the achievement of the objectives of the "North American waterfowl management plan", and

whereas the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan are hosting the 1987 Conference of Ramsar Parties in Regina and are thus continuing to play a lead role,

therefore it is recommended that:

(1) all interested groups commit finances or assistance, wherever possible, to ensure the success of the 1987 Regina conference,

(2) Canada support the proposed amendments to the Convention text which will make the Convention machinery more effective,

(3) the governments of Canada and of the provinces and the territories take direct action to designate new wetlands of international importance for the Ramsar list to coincide with Wildlife '87, and

(4) the opportunity provided by Wildlife '87 and the Regina conference be used to increase public awareness of the need for retention and wise use of wetlands.

Recommendation No. 15 (National Wildlife Week)

It is recommended that the 36 recommendations of the report of the committee which reviewed the National Wildlife Week program in 1984, and which were accepted by the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference at Timmins as guidelines for the National Wildlife Week program (Recommendation No. 10), be formally sent out as guidelines to the provinces, territories and Canadian Wildlife Service in furthering effective implementation of the program.

Recommendation No. 16 (Workshop 1 - Twinning of wildlife agencies)

It is recommended that the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference request CIDA to explore the possibility and mechanisms of twinning wildlife agencies in Canada with selected, suitable agencies in developing countries. The report could prepare profiles and descriptions for Canadian and overseas agencies examining such things as capabilities, objectives, benefits, drawbacks, needs and attitudes.

Recommendation No. 17 (Workshop 1 - Environmental assessment)

It is recommended that the conference endorse the development of an environmental assessment review process by CIDA for all projects, and encourage other agencies involved in funding development and industrial projects in developing countries to adopt appropriate environmental impact assessment policies. The policies should give attention to post-project evaluation.

Recommendation No. 18 (Workshop 1 - Wildlife management workshops)

It is recommended that the conference request CIDA to examine the possibility of a series of wildlife management workshops in developing countries in co-operation with selected Canadian university and college faculties, and with the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference or an NGO.

Recommendation No. 19 (Workshop 1 - CIDA's wildlife conservation projects)

It is recommended that the conference request CIDA to review the appropriateness of its level of funding for wildlife conservation projects as a proportion of its total budget.

Recommendation No. 20 (Workshop 2 - Canadian Wildlife Service - International activities)

Whereas lack of information and misconceptions of Canada's wildlife programs affect our country's reputation and our use of natural resources,

therefore it is recommended that federal, provincial and territorial wildlife agencies improve the marketing of Canadian wildlife programs which are consistent with the "World conservation strategy" by:

(a) having the Canadian Wildlife Service take a leadership role in disseminating information on these programs to the international media,

(b) taking advantage of international meetings to promote wildlife programs through exhibits,

(c) liaising with media of foreign countries to come and discuss these programs, and

(d) having the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference appoint a media contact person on the Program Committee to develop a communication plan to promote the conference and ensure the dissemination of conference results.

Recommendation No. 21 (Workshop 2 - International wildlife conservation)

Whereas Canada presently needs a stronger focus on international wildlife conservation,

therefore it is recommended that the Canadian Wildlife Service, in consultation with the provinces and territories, take steps to deal more effectively with international wildlife issues.

Recommendation No. 22 (Workshop 2 - Wildlife education)

Whereas education is one of the major pillars of wildlife conservation,

therefore it is recommended that the federal, provincial and territorial wildlife agencies and non-governmental organizations expand their work with departments of education to incorporate wildlife management concepts into school curricula.

Recommendation No. 23 (Workshop 2 - Agency reports on international wildlife conservation efforts)

It is recommended that the federal, provincial and territorial wildlife agencies report regularly to the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference on their efforts in aid of international wildlife conservation.

Recommendation No. 24 (Workshop 3 - CITES)

Whereas a number of deficiencies have been identified in the structure and procedures of CITES,

therefore it is recommended that CITES pursue its efforts to make the necesssary adjustments to its structures and procedures in order to make its meetings and decision-making process more effective. Furthermore, the CITES Secretariat is encouraged to take the necessary steps to ensure that proposals for additions to or deletions from CITES Appendices are scientifically and statistically sound.

Recommendation No. 25 (Workshop 4 - Invitation - External Affairs)

It is recommended that a letter be sent to the Department of External Affairs, by the Secretary of the conference, expressing the regret of the conference that a representative from that department was not present at the 50th Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference.

It is further recommended that the Department of External Affairs be urged to attend relevant Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conferences, and that its contact person for wildlife-related international issues be invited to make a report on that agency's wildlife-related operations.

COMMENTS ON CONFERENCE

L. Mason
US Fish and Wildlife Service
International Affairs

I want to express, on behalf of the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the non-governmental organizations that were here from the United States, our appreciation for the opportunity, and the pleasure, of participating in another Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference. It has been enlightening for me. It has been informative as well.

I think the theme of the conference is timely as a subject for concerned debate. For the reasons that Dave Munro mentioned earlier, Canada has a growing degree of credibility in the world conservation community, and with it I think you will gain a growing responsibility. We in the United States appreciate, as conservationists, the leadership role that you are assuming and we appreciate, as neighbours, the opportunity to share in that effort. For example, the "North American waterfowl management plan" is a model to which Parties to the Migratory Species Convention can look. In our co-operation on that plan, we are thus supporting the positive notions of that Convention, without becoming associated with the downside problems of membership.

I appreciated the chance to participate in preparations for the 1987 Ramsar Conference, which occupied a good bit of my time here. That conference should be a watershed opportunity for preserving wetlands globally; inclusion of a North American day in that conference is also a symbol of that sharing.

Certainly, I think your debate of Canada's role in world wildlife conservation will not be closed with the adjournment of this conference, but we did want to congratulate you on an excellent 50th Federal-Provincial. We wanted to thank you both for your hospitality and for the chance to participate in the substance of the meetings.

ATTENDANCE AT THE 50TH CONFERENCE

R. (Bob) Andrews
Director of Wildlife
Fish and Wildlife Division
Department of Energy and
Natural Resources
Government of Alberta
Petroleum Plaza, North Tower
9920 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2C9

Cpl. Derrick Anthony
Federal Enforcement Branch
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
1200 Alta Vista Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0R2

Judith Armatage
(Canadian Nature Federation)
2418 Huntley Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K1V 8E6

John Bain
Ontario Manager
Ducks Unlimited (Canada)
Unit 10
240 Bayview Drive
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 4Y8

John Bailey
Co-ordinator,Program Transfers
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the Northwest
Territories
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

John Baird
Chief Wildlife Biologist
Fish and Wildlife Branch
Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

Sonja Bata, Director
Bata Limited and
International Trustee
World Wildlife Fund
59 Wynford Drive
Don Mills, Ontario
M3C 1K3

The Hon. Rhéal Bélisle
Deputy Speaker of the Senate
Room 361-S
Parliament Buildings
Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A4

Mike Berger
Director
National/International Operations
Ducks Unlimited Inc.
1 Waterfowl Way at Gilmer Road
Long Grove, Illinois 60047-0216
USA

Jack Berryman
Executive Vice-President
International Association of
Fish and Wildlife Agencies
1412 - 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
USA

Richard Bill
Planner
National Parks Systems Division
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 1G2

Hans Blokpoel
Wildlife Biologist
Ontario Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
1725 Woodward Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

James W. Bourque
Deputy Minister
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the Northwest
Territories
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

Hugh Boyd
A/Regional Director
Ontario Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
1725 Woodward Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Trina Brothers
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the Northwest
Territories
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

Joseph E. Bryant
447 Thessaly Circle
Ottawa, Ontario
K1H 5W7

Kenneth A. Brynaert
Executive Vice-President
Canadian Wildlife Federation
1673 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 3Z1

Patrick Calnan
Communications Assistant
Wildlife Habitat Canada
Suite 301, 1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 1C7

Dr. R.R. Campbell
Senior Policy/Program Adviser
Northern and Inland Fisheries
Fisheries Research Branch
Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Station No. 1256, 200 Kent Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E6

Gisèle Cantin
Directrice
Affaires multilatérales
Ministère de l'Environnement
22^{e} étage
Terrasses de la Chaudière
10 rue Wellington
(Hull (Québec)
K1A 0H3

J.F.T. Carreiro
A/Chief
Wildlife Conservation
Ontario Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
1725 Woodward Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Gilles Chretien
Association provincial des
trappeurs du Québec
84 Lisieux
Gatineau (Québec)
J8T 4P3

J. Cinq-Mars
Regional Director
Quebec Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
1141, route de l'Eglise
CP 10100
Sainte-Foy, Quebec
G1V 4H5

Tom Clark
Consultant
CMC Ecological Consulting
RR #3
North Augusta, Ontario
K0G 1R0

H. Anthony Clarke
Director General
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Dr. Bertrand des Clers
Director
International Foundation for
the Conservation of Game
15 rue de Téhéran
75008 Paris, France

Kenneth W. Cox
National Program Co-ordinator
Wildlife Habitat Canada
Suite 301, 1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 1C7

Steve Curtis
A/Director
Migratory Birds Branch
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

C. Dauphiné
Co-ordinator
Threatened Species and
Transboundary Wildlife
Wildlife Research and
Interpretation Branch
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Paul B. Dean
Consultant
2641 Merivale Road
Nepean, Ontario
K2C 3A1

Pierre Desmeules
Scientific Adviser
CITES
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Kenneth F. DesRoches
Deputy Minister
Department of Community
and Cultural Affairs
PO Box 2000
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8

François Drolet
Direction de la conservation
de la faune
Ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse,
de la Pêche et du Tourisme
Gouvernement du Québec
150 boulevard Saint-Cyrille est
Québec (Québec)
G1R 4Y3

Mrs. Theresa Dupuis
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Harold Eidsvik
Senior Policy Adviser
Program Policy Group
Parks Canada
Room 523, 5th Floor
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 1G2

Dr. George Finney
Regional Director
Atlantic Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
PO Box 1590
Sackville, New Brunswick
E0A 3C0

Kathy Fischer
Co-ordinator, LRTAP Program
Wildlife Toxicology Section
Wildlife Research and
Interpretation Branch
National Wildlife Research Centre
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Arthur Frayling
Executive Consultant and
Vice-President
International Fur Trade Federation
67 Upper Thames Street
London, England
EC4V 5AH

Rob Gardner, Vice-President
Federation of Alberta Naturalists
c/o 508 - 1st Street, SE
Medicine Hat, Alberta
T1A 1T3

Dr. Fred Gilbert, Professor
Department of Wildlife Biology
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164-4220
USA

Ray Gilbert
Executive Director
Fur Institute of Canada
Suite 205, PO Box 29
60 Bloor Street, West
Toronto, Ontario
M4W 3B8

David Gimmer
President
Ottawa Duck Club Inc.
34 Cedarview Road
Nepean, Ontario
K2B 6K1

Richard Goulden
Director, Wildlife Branch
Department of Natural Resources
Government of Manitoba
PO Box 24
1495 St. James Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3H 0W9

Roland Grant
Secrétaire-Trésorier
Fédération Québécoise
des Gestionnaires de ZEC Inc.
2016 Fortier
Jonquière (Québec)

Paul A. Gray, Supervisor
Habitat Management Section
Wildlife Management Division
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the Northwest
Territories
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

Diane Griffin
Executive Director
Island Nature Trust
PO Box 265
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
CLA 7K4

Dr. Gary M. Gurbin
Parliamentary Secretary to the
Minister of Environment Canada
Confederation Building
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Douglas Hagan, Supervisor
Wildlife Program Development
Wildlife Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources
Room 2321, Whitney Block
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1W3

William (Bill) Hall
Assistant Director of Wildlife
Fish and Wildlife Division
Department of Energy and
Natural Resources
Government of Alberta
Petroleum Plaza, North Tower
9920 - 108 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2C9

Eldon Hawton
Manager, Member Services
Ontario Trappers' Association
Box 705
North Bay, Ontario
P1A 3P1

Del Haylock
Executive Director
Fur Council of Canada
Suite 1270, 1435 St. Alexandre
Montreal, Quebec
H3A 2G4

Stephen Hazell
Corporate Counsel
Canadian Wildlife Federation
1673 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 3Z1

Richard J. Herring
Assistant Deputy Minister
Canadian Forestry Service
Agriculture Canada
21st Floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Boulevard
Hull, Quebec
K1A 1G5

Harry E. Hodgdon
Executive Director
The Wildlife Society
5410 Grosvenor Lane
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
USA

Walter Hopewell
Treasurer
Ottawa Duck Club Inc.
3421 Carling Avenue
Nepean, Ontario
K2H 7V5

Grant Hopkins
Outdoor Columnist
Ottawa Duck Club Inc.
6074 Vineyard Drive
Orleans, Ontario
K1C 2M5

Barry Hughson
Faunal Scientist
Parks Canada
Environment Canada
2nd Floor, North Tower
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Hull, Quebec
K1A 1G2

Monte Hummel
President
World Wildlife Fund (Canada)
Suite 201
60 St. Clair Avenue, East
Toronto, Ontario
M4T 1N5

Hugh Hunt
Superintendent of Wildlife
Department of Parks and
Renewable Resources
Government of Saskatchewan
3211 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 5W6

Gilles Hupé
Vice-Président
Fédération Québécoise
des Gestionnaires de ZEC Inc.
517 de la Cathédrale
Rimouski (Québec)
G5L 5N4

Jim Inder
Assistant Deputy Minister
Parks, Recreation and Wildlife
Department of Culture,
Recreation and Youth
Province of Newfoundland
3rd Floor, Confederation Complex
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Amanda M. Jones
Program Officer
Wildlife Habitat Canada
1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 1C7

Scott Jones
(Acting President
Wildlife Society of Canada)
Environmental Biologist
Ministry of Natural Resources
322 Kent Street, West
Lindsay, Ontario
K9V 4T7

Neal Jotham
Co-ordinator
Humane Trapping
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Mireille Katz
Assistant
International Relations
IUCN
Avenue du Mont-Blanc
1196 Gland, Switzerland

J.A. (Tony) Keith
Director
Wildlife Research and
Interpretation Branch
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Trevor Kellar
Regional Wildlife Biologist
Ministry of Natural Resources
Concession Road
Kemptville, Ontario
K0G 1J0

Gordon Kerr
Regional Director
Western and Northern Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Room 230, 4999 - 98th Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6B 2X3

Juliette Krause
Executive Officer
International Fur
Trade Federation
67 Upper Thames Street
London, England
EC4V 3AH

L. Lamarre-Proulx
Conseiller juridique
Service juridique
Environnement Canada
6e étage, Place Vincent Massey
351 boulevard Saint-Joseph
Hull (Québec)
K1A 0E7

Sylvain Lamoureux
Accords et nouvelles perspectives
internationales
450 rue Rideau
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1N 5Z4

Eugene Lapointe
Secretary General
Convention on International
Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)
6 rue du Maupas
Case postale 78
CH-1000
Lausanne 9, Switzerland

Mrs. Lynn Laprise-Gauthier
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

John Law
Deputy Minister
Department of Parks and
Renewable Resources
Government of Saskatchewan
3211 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 5W6

Dr. Louis Lemieux
President
Diomedia Consultants
Suite 2202
505 St. Laurent Boulevard
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 9E7

David Livingstone
Environmental Impact Scientist
Marine Environment Division
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
Room 648, 6th Floor
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H4

Kevin Lloyd
Director
Wildlife Management Division
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the Northwest
Territories
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

Judy Lord, Editor
Nature Canada
Canadian Nature Federation
Suite 203, 75 Alberta Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6G1

Dr. A.J. (Sandy) Macaulay
Chief Biologist
Ducks Unlimited Canada
1190 Waverley Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2E2

Barry Kent MacKay
Representative
International Wildlife Coalition
197 Main Street
Unionville, Ontario
L3R 2G8

Lynda Maltby
Senior Adviser and
  Planning Co-ordinator
Director General's Office
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Frank Manuel
Deputy Minister
Department of Culture,
  Recreation and Youth
Government of Newfoundland
PO Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Keith Marshall, Head
Toxic Chemicals Programs Section
Wildlife Research and Interpretation
  Branch
National Wildlife Research Centre
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Dr. Art Martell
Regional Director
Pacific and Yukon Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
5421 Robertson Road
PO Box 340
Delta, British Columbia
V4K 3Y3

George Martin
Director, Habitat
Ottawa Duck Club Inc.
35 Lindenlee Road
Ottawa, Ontario
K1M 1A7

Larry Mason
International Affairs
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Department of the Interior
Room 2441, 18th and C Streets, NW
Washington, DC 20240
USA

Mrs. Roxanne Massé-Proulx
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

The Hon. Colin Maxwell
Minister of Parks and
  Renewable Resources
Room 340, Legislative Building
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B3

Jan McDonnell
District Biologist
Ministry of Natural Resources
Box 605
Brockville, Ontario
K6V 5Y8

Fred McFarland
Acting Chief
Terrestrial Environment Division
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
Room 640, 6th Floor
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
10 Wellington Street
Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H4

Bob McLean
Assistant to the Administrator
Convention on International Trade
  in Endangered Species (CITES)
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Barry Meadows, Director
Fish and Wildlife Branch
Department of Forests,
Mines and Energy
Government of New Brunswick
PO Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

T.J. Millard
Executive Co-ordinator
Outdoor Recreation Group
Ministry of Natural Resources
Province of Ontario
Room 2341, Whitney Block
99 Wellesley Street, West
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1W3

Mary Mogford
Deputy Minister
Ministry of Natural Resources
Government of Ontario
Room 6320, Whitney Block
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1W3

Hugh Monaghan
Director
Fish and Wildlife Branch
Department of Renewable Resources
Government of the Yukon Territory
PO Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
Y1A 2C6

Rick Morgan
Executive Vice-President
Ontario Federation of
Anglers and Hunters
PO Box 28
Peterborough, Ontario
K9J 6Y5

D. Stewart Morrison
Executive Vice-President
Ducks Unlimited Canada
1190 Waverley Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 2E2

Dr. David Munro
President
Naivasha Consultants
2513 Amherst Avenue
Sidney, British Columbia
V8L 2H3

Luba Mycio-Mommers
National Programs Director
Canadian Wildlife Federation
1673 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 3Z1

Daniel Navid, Head
International Relations
IUCN
Avenue du Mont-Blanc
1196 Gland, Switzerland

David Neave
Executive Director
Wildlife Habitat Canada
Suite 301
1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 1C7

Harvey K. Nelson
Regional Director
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Federal Building
Fort Snelling
Twin Cities, Minnesota 55111
USA

Mrs. Sylvia Normand
Assistant Secretary
Federal-Provincial
Wildlife Conference
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Peter O'Malley
President
O'Malley Communications
Suite 310
130 Slater Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6E2

Ron Orenstein
Representative
International Wildlife Coalition
Suite 203
121 Richmond Street, West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2K1

Richard M. Parsons
Attorney
Washington Counsel
Safari Club International
5151 East Broadway
Suite 1680
Tucson, Arizona 85711
USA

Dr. James Paterson, Director
National Waterfowl Management
  Plan Implementation
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

The Hon. Red Pedersen, MLA
Minister of Renewable Resources
6th Floor, Laing Building
Government of the Northwest
  Territories
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

D.G. Pike, Director
Wildlife Division
Department of Culture,
  Recreation and Youth
Building 810, Pleasantville
Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

Douglas Pollock, Director
Management & Administration Branch
Secretary
Federal-Provincial Wildlife
  Conference
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

The Hon. David Porter, MLA
Minister of Renewable Resources
Yukon Territorial Government
PO Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon Territory
Y1A 2C6

W.H. Prescott
A/Senior Scientific Adviser
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

M.H. Prime
Director, Wildlife Division
Department of Lands and Forests
Province of Nova Scotia
PO Box 516
Kentville, Nova Scotia
B4N 3X3

Gabriel Racle
Editor
Canadian Wildlife Federation
1673 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 3Z1

A.W. Rathwell
Head, Communications Section
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Julyan Reid
Director General
Intergovernmental Affairs Directorate
Environment Canada
22nd Floor
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H3

Ralph Roberts
Chief, Forestry Sector
Canadian International Development Agency
Hull, Quebec
K1A 0G4

W. David Robertson
Co-ordinator
Fish and Wildlife Programs
c/o Sir Sandford Fleming College
PO Box 8000
Lindsay, Ontario
K9V 4T4

Wayne Roddick
Communication Manager
Wildlife Habitat Canada
Suite 301, 1704 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 1C7

Nestor Romaniuk
President
Alberta Fish and Game Association
11921 Albert Trail
Edmonton, Alberta
T59 4G5

J.D. Roseborough
Consultant
143 Glenrove Avenue, West
Toronto, Ontario
M4R 1P1

S. Rutherford
Research Officer
Research Branch
Library of Parliament
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A9

Geneviève Sainte-Marie
Deputy Minister
Environment Canada
Terrasses de la Chaudière
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H3

Herman Schwenk
Member
Unifarm Association
Box 386
Coronation, Alberta
T0C 1C0

Ken Seabrook
2nd Vice-president
Ontario Trappers' Association
Box 705
North Bay, Ontario
P1B 8J8

Jack Shaver
Chairman
Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council
11443 - 39 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6J 0M5

Gregg Sheehy
Conservation Director
Canadian Nature Federation
Suite 203, 75 Albert Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6G1

Dennis Sherratt
Director, Wildlife Branch
Department of Parks and
Renewable Resources
Government of Saskatchewan
3211 Albert Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 5W6

Don W. Simkin
Director, Wildlife Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources
Province of Ontario
Whitney Block, Room 2327
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1W3

Michael Smart
Assistant Director (Conservation)
IWRB (International Waterfowl
Research Bureau)
Slimbridge, Glos.
England GL2 7BK

Arthur Smith, Director
Fish and Wildlife Unit
Department of Community
and Cultural Affairs
Province of Prince Edward Island
Jones Building, 11 Kent Street
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8

Kirk Smith, Chairman
Public Information Committee
Fur Institute of Canada
60 Bloor Street, West
Suite 205, PO Box 29
Toronto, Ontario
M4W 3B8

Maria L. Smith
Policy and Research Assistant
Canadian Wildlife Federation
1673 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2A 3Z1

The Hon. Herbert O. Sparrow
Deputy Chairman
Senate Standing Committee on
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Room 263E, Centre Block
Parliament Building
Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A4

Sue Stephenson
Conservation Assistant
Canadian Nature Federation
Suite 203, 75 Albert Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6G1

Donna Stewart, Ecologist
Terrestrial Environment Division
Natural Resources and Economic
Development Branch
Northern Affairs Program
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
6th Floor
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
10 Wellington Street
Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H4

Walt Stieglitz
Associate Director
Wildlife Resources
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Interior Building
Washington, DC 20240
USA

Dr. Ian Stirling
Research Scientist
Western and Northern Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
4999 - 98th Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6B 2X3

Jim Stoner, Chief
Regulations & Enforcement Division
Migratory Birds Branch
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Toby Styles
Director
Canadian Association of Zoological
Parks and Aquariums (CAZPA)
c/o Metro Toronto Zoo
Box 280
West Hill, Ontario
M1E 4R5

Gaston Tessier
Ontario Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
1725 Woodward Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Inspector George Timko
Officer-in-Charge
Federal Enforcement Branch
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
1200 Alta Vista Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0R2

Ron Tomosk
Vice-President
Ottawa Duck Club Inc.
6 Lynhurst Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K1V 9W7

Barry Turner, MP
Member for Ottawa-Carleton
Room 214, West Block
House of Commons
Parliament Building
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Robyn Usher
Wildlife Biologist
Beak Associates
250, 2635 - 37th Avenue, NE
Calgary, Alberta
T1Y 5Z6

Mrs. Suzanne Vincent-Turcotte
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E7

Jim Walker, Director
Wildlife Branch
Ministry of Environment
Government of British Columbia
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X5

Leonard Werner
President
Hudson's Bay Company
Fur Sales Canada Limited
65 Skyway Avenue
Rexdale, Ontario
M9W 6C7

Penny West
Administrative Assistant
to Regional Director
Western and Northern Region
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
4999 - 98th Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6B 2X3

Laurel Whistance-Smith
Supervisor
Extension Development
Wildlife Branch
Ministry of Nature Resources
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1W3

Kathryn Wiegers
Ministerial Assistant
Saskatchewan Parks and
Renewable Resources
Room 340, Legislative Building
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B3

John Williamson
Regional Biologist
Ministry of Natural Resources
Concession Road
Kemptville, Ontario
K0G 1J0